DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 414 SO 024 241

AUTHOR Bicouvaris, Mary Vassilikou
TITLE Building a Consensus for the Development of National Standards in History.
PUB DATE May 94
NOTE 194p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Old Dominion University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Dynamics; Group Experience; *History; *History Instruction; Persuasive Discourse
IDENTIFIERS Consensus; *National History Standards; *National History Standards Project

ABSTRACT

This document presents a research project that examined the process used by the National History Standards Project to build consensus for the development of national standards for teaching history in U.S. schools. Among the contentious issues on which the National History Standards Project had to reach consensus were: (1) content versus process; (2) the place of western civilization in the teaching of world history; and (3) the inclusion of minority contributions in the teaching of U.S. history. This dissertation is a case study that creates a chain of evidence with explicit links between the questions asked, the data collected, and the conclusions drawn. Multiple sources of evidence include primary data, participant observations, with purposeful group interviews conducted to corroborate the evidence. The conclusion reached in this study is that the National History Standards Project achieved a substantial and broad consensus of historians, professional associations, precollegiate teachers, and a wide spectrum of civic, educational, professional, and minority associations to write national standards for history. How the consensus building process of the National History Standards Project might be applied to similar situations is also discussed. Contains 184 references. (DK)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED 381 414

# BUILDING A CONSENSUS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS IN HISTORY

by

Mary Vassilikou Bicouvaris

B.S. June, 1963, Ohio State University
M.A. May, 1970, The College of William and Mary

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

URBAN SERVICES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
May, 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary V. Bicouvaris
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Approved By:

Dr. Dwight W. Allen, Chair

Dr. Maurice R. Berube, Member

Dr. Jane Hager, Concentration Area Graduate Program Director

Ms. Francie Alexander, Member

Dr. Donald A. Myers, Dean

SO 024 341

Copyright by Mary Vassilikou Bicouvaris
1994

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

Statement of the Problem ..... 1

Significance of the Study ..... 1

Background of the Problem ..... 3

Rationale ..... 13

Propositions ..... 16

Research Questions ..... 17

Definition of Terms ..... 18

Limitations of the Study ..... 19

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ..... 22

Educational Reform ..... 22

National Standards ..... 26

National History Standards ..... 33

Controversial Issues in History ..... 40

Building Consensus ..... 58

Management of Conflict for Consensus Building..... 63

III. METHODOLOGY ..... 69

Principles of Data Collection ..... 70

Type of Data ..... 71

Data Collection Process ..... 72

Method of Data Analysis ..... 76

IV. BUILDING CONSENSUS ..... 78

Organizational Structure ..... 78

Membership of the National History Standards Project ..... 83

Timetable of the National History Standards Project ..... 86

Controversial Issues ..... 89

Building Consensus ..... 109

Unresolved Issues ..... 125

The National History Standards Project: A Model for Standards-Setting Organizations ..... 129

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 135

Conclusions ..... 140

Contributions to Research ..... 146

Recommendations for Future Research..... 149

EPILOGUE ..... 152

NOTES ..... 154

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 175

APPENDIXES ..... 187

APPENDIX A

Membership List of the National Council for Education Standards & Testing (NCEST) ..... 187

APPENDIX B

Pre-Interview Letter ..... 190

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions ..... 192

APPENDIX D

Interview Questionnaire (codification) ..... 194

APPENDIX E

Purposeful Group Interview Participants..... 196

APPENDIX F

Organizational Structure (proposed) ..... 201

APPENDIX G

Organizational Structure (revised) ..... 203

APPENDIX H

Rosters of Participants ..... 205

APPENDIX I

Renditions of standards ..... 223

APPENDIX J

Analysis of data based on C.W. Moore's Theoretical Model ..... 232

ABSTRACT

BUILDING A CONSENSUS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF NATIONAL STANDARDS IN HISTORY

Mary V. Bicouvaris
Old Dominion University, 1994
Dissertation Chair: Dr. Dwight W. Allen

This research project examines the process used by the National History Standards Project to build consensus for the development of national standards for teaching history in America's schools.

Since the publication of A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform by the National Commission of Excellence in Education in 1983, the American educational community has been in the grips of a reform movement. The aim of this movement is to examine where we have been and where we are going as a nation and to redefine what we believe in and what we believe is important to teach our children if they are to be successful participants in the twenty-first century. In 1989, former President George Bush and the governors of all 50 states gathered in Charlottesville, Virginia, to set national education goals. In 1990, six goals were established for American education. Of these six goals, the third addressed the need to develop national standards of learning in the core subjects. This national standards movement which began during the Bush administration has continued in the administration of President Bill Clinton.

Designed by Charlotte Crabtree and directed by Crabtree and

Gary Nash, the National History Standards Project included representatives of every affiliated professional organization and involved a wide array of people representing America's cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity.

Among the contentious issues on which the National History Standards Project had to reach consensus if it was to fulfill its mission of writing national standards for the teaching of history in America's schools were content versus process, the place of western civilization in the teaching of world history, and the inclusion of minority contributions in the teaching of United States history. A case study, developed according to the established protocol of propositions to be examined and questions to be asked, this dissertation creates a chain of evidence with explicit links between the questions asked, the data collected, and the conclusions drawn. Multiple sources of evidence include primary data, participant observations, with purposeful group interviews conducted to corroborate the evidence.

The conclusion reached in this study is that the National History Standards Project achieved a substantial and broad consensus of historians, professional associations, pre-collegiate teachers and a wide spectrum of civic, educational, professional and minority associations to write national standards for history.

# CHAPTER I
# INTRODUCTION

## Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine how the National History Standards Project used a consensus to establish national standards for teaching history. The National History Standards Project was undertaken by the National Center for History in the Schools, a Cooperative University of California Los Angeles/ National Endowment for the Humanities Research Program. The project, which was funded by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Endowment of the Humanities was charged to "develop and disseminate national achievement standards for the United States and World History in the nation's schools."[1] The directors of the project envisioned the process of developing national standards for history as a cooperative effort between scholars and pre-collegiate teachers, one which would be achieved by consensus. They wrote:

> Developing through a broad-based national consensus-building process, this task involves working toward agreement both on the larger purposes of history in the school curriculum and on the more specific historical understandings and reasoning processes all students should have equal opportunity to acquire over twelve years of precollegiate education.[2]

## Significance of the Study

Robert K. Yin says that a case research is significant when the case is unusual and of general public interest, when the

underlying issues are of national importance, or when both of the preceding conditions exist.[3] This research will be completed concurrent with the presentation of the national history standards for approval by pre-collegiate teachers, organizations of historians and teachers, policy makers, and the American public at large. This study provides a timely explanation of the process used in setting national standards for history, and it helps clarify the process which brought about a consensus.

Bruce L. Wilson and Gretchen B. Rossman, authors of Mandating Academic Excellence, say:

> ...the development of a shared vision for education requires that...those with a legitimate voice in that process, have the knowledge and skills to articulate various aims of education, discuss competing views rationally, consider alternatives, and reach consensus. These skills are prerequisites to the reasoned, sensitive and respectful deliberations necessary to develop a vision for education.[4]

This study demonstrates how the various groups involved in setting national history standards developed, by consensus, a vision and a framework which informed their work.

This study is also significant for its potential usefulness in answering the myriad questions which the various groups interested in national history standards will have, thus facilitating the process of implementing standards.

Introducing the national history standards to the diverse interest groups will require careful answers to such questions as how those standards came about, how agreement was reached about what should be included in national standards in history, and how controversial issues were resolved. This research provides

answers to those questions.

From any perspective, the issue of setting history standards is of serious concern. The movement to set national standards grew out of a concern about the education of all American children, especially the urban poor and minorities. While setting history standards has been driven by the concern that all our children are not historically literate, the dearth of historical knowledge of and appreciation for the rich and diverse heritage of this nation among the urban poor has been of particular concern. In What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know, Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr. have documented the serious deficiencies in the knowledge of history among American students. Further, they have illustrated that these deficiencies are greater among the urban poor, many of whom are children from minority ethnic and racial backgrounds.[5]

Furthermore, this study is a pioneering effort to document the monumental and unprecedented process involved in establishing national standards for teaching history. The idea of writing national standards for each of the subjects that students are taught in K-12 is a new phenomenon in the United States. This documentation of the process of developing standards for history with its examination of consensus-building among the diverse interest participants is of immediate and future value. It provides an example for similar standard-setting efforts, and it makes a significant contribution to the literature.

Background of the Problem

Before one can understand how the National History Standards Project built a consensus to establish national standards for history, one must first understand the nature of American education, the conditions that led to the debate about national standards and the web of panels, councils, and projects aimed at the articulation and development of national standards in education.

The current movement toward national standards in American education is historic and unprecedented. Since the United States Constitution leaves the responsibility of educating the young up to the states, local control has been the centerpiece of public education for over 200 years. In the last ten years, however, much has changed, and the call for national standards in education has been in the center of that change. Chester E. Finn, Jr. describes this significant change:

> I think it is extraordinary even to be having this discussion in the United States in 1988, especially the part of the discussion that takes it for granted that setting national standards is a reasonable proposition, and that we are mainly discussing the kinds of standards we should have and how to get them. Not long ago, this would have been deemed a radical, vaguely traitorous idea and anybody...would have been expected to denounce it as un-American...[6]

Maurice R. Berube in his book American Presidents and Education, discusses previous national efforts concerning education. Berube says that in the early years of the Republic, the first six American presidents expressed the desire to give education a national focus, but the issue of constitutionality tempered all

their attempts.[7]

The current debate concerning national standards has been borne of the concern of many that the education of American children is not good enough. According to Diane Ravitch, this debate:

> ...has roots that extend over the past century. In the late nineteenth century, educators worried about the seeming disorganization of the high school curriculum and wondered whether there should be differentiation between students bound for college and those bound for work.[8]

The Committee of Ten, a prestigious commission appointed to study "the seeming disorganization of the high school curriculum..."[9] urged that "a common liberal education was the best preparation for the duties of life, whatever the pupils' later destination."[10] They recommended that "all students should study English, history, foreign language, science, and mathematics."[11]

The current movement toward national standards started in 1983 when the National Commission on Excellence in Education, in what was heralded as An Open Letter to the American People, presented its report to Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell. The National Commission's report, entitled A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform,[12] alarmed our nation and sent shock waves reverberating throughout the education establishment. It said in part:

> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made

> in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.[13]

Five months later, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching issued the results of a three year study by Ernest Boyer called High School.[14] It recommended sweeping changes in curriculum and assessment along with a host of other reforms.[15] From 1984 to 1989, in response to the A Nation At Risk report, many organizations announced proposals for the improvement of American education. These proposals included plans to reform teacher education, plans to improve urban schools, strategies to deal effectively with disadvantaged children in school, school choice plans and more.

These events led to the historic Education Summit held in Charlottesville, Virginia, in September of 1989. Calling their agreement a Jeffersonian Compact, former President George Bush and the nation's governors agreed to set performance goals for the nation's schools.[16] In February 1990, the governors endorsed six National Education Goals to improve American education:

1. By the year 2000, all the children in America will start school ready to learn.

2. By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

3. By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, six, eight and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

4. By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

5. By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.[17]

In July 1990, President Bush and the National Governors' Association agreed to form a National Education Goals Panel, whose job it would be to monitor educational progress toward meeting the National Education Goals and to prepare a report on that progress.[18] On April 18, 1991, President Bush unveiled America 2000: An Education Strategy,[19] a plan to move America toward the National Education Goals adopted by the President and the Governors. Prominently featured in America 2000 was a call for both world class standards for American students as well as a new, voluntary nationwide examination system to monitor student progress.[20] President Bush, speaking in Grand Junction, Colorado, about America 2000 said:

> Our America 2000 Education Strategy challenges all Americans to raise expectations -- to pledge genuine accountability and to create a new generation of American schools. It sets out to transform a nation at risk into a nation of students. It calls for cultivating communities where learning can and will happen.[21]

The National Council on Education Standards and Testing was created by Congress (Public Law 102-62) on June 27, 1991[22] in order to articulate the issues related to National Education Goal 3 and to:

> ... advise on the desirability and feasibility of national standards and tests and recommend long term policies, structures and mechanisms for setting voluntary education standards and planning an appropriate system of tests.[23]

To carry out its responsibilities, the National Council on Education Standards and Testing created eight task forces. Three dealt with standards, assessment and implementation respectively. Each of the remaining five represented one of the core disciplines named in the goals: English, mathematics, science, geography and history. These task forces advised the National Council on Education Standards and Testing on the following questions:

1. What is the status of efforts to develop standards in your discipline?
2. Are national standards desirable given the wide range of student performance?
3. Are standards that challenge all children without penalizing those of lesser opportunity feasible?
4. Who should develop the standards and how should they be developed? What national, state and local curriculum materials are the best available?
5. How long will it take to develop the material? What can be done to expedite the process?[24]

The National Council on Education Standards and Testing was co-chaired by governors Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. of South Carolina and Roy Romer of Colorado. In an unprecedented bi-partisan effort, they brought together all the diverse groups represented in the National Council for Education Standards and Testing to complete the tasks mandated by Congress. (Appendix A)

Campbell and Romer represented virtually all the states' governors, including Bill Clinton of Arkansas, Evan Bayh of

Indiana, John Ashcroft of Missouri, Terry Branstad of Iowa, and Booth Gardner of Washington. Together with President Bush and Richard Riley the former governor of South Carolina, they were determined to move the education agenda forward, with or without the help of educators.

Both Romer and Campbell believed that setting national standards was a desired goal for education. Speaking of the desirability for standards, Romer said:

> As I contemplate my own education, I was always compared to the rest of my class, or my class was compared to the school across the street...But seldom, in my life have I had an educational standard that said this is what you are supposed to know and be able to do, and we will be judged by that standard...[25]

The solidarity of the movement to establish national standards has continued under President Clinton's leadership. As governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton was one of the most formidable voices for education reform, national standards and national assessments. When the National Council for Education Standards and Testing invited testimonies from prominent policy makers and educators regarding their views and advice to the Council on the desirability and feasibility of national standards, Deborah S. Walz, from the Office of the Governor of Arkansas Bill Clinton, submitted the following comments:

> I support the concept of national standards and an assessment system because both are necessary to enable American students to be competitive for successful careers and lives in a world-wide economy...A fair organized, national assessment system is the key to successful change.[26]

As President of the United States, Clinton has been an advocate of national goals and standards. His education strategy

known as Goals 2000: Educate America Act aims at writing the six National Education Goals into law. One of the purposes of Goals 2000 is to:

> ...develop and adopt...challenging national performance standards that define what all students should know and be able to do in core subjects areas such as science, math, history, English, geography, foreign languages, and the arts, and support local reform efforts to make those standards a reality in every classroom."[27]

Since the six National Goals were adopted in 1990, proponents of arts education, civics and government, and foreign languages have joined the five core subjects mentioned in national education Goal 3 to write national standards for their respective subjects.[28]

U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley is equally as committed as President Clinton to the improvement of American education. Speaking to a House subcommittee on education, Riley said:

> ...we must raise our expectations for all children, and align every aspect of education curriculum, professional development and assessments - to the high ground of academic excellence.[29]

In their reports, the National Council on Education Standards and Testing task forces on English, mathematics, science, geography and history agreed that national standards in each of the subjects were desirable and feasible. While they all anticipated a number of problems which would have to be addressed, all except the English task force projected a date by which they expected the development of standards to be completed.[30] In their meeting with the National Council on Education Standards and

Testing, the History Task Force presented a sample of national content and performance standards in history.[31]

The National Council on Education Standards and Testing presented its final report to the U.S. Congress and the American people on January 24, 1992. They said in part:

> While mindful of the technical and political challenges the Council concludes that national standards and a system of assessments are desirable and feasible mechanisms for raising expectations, revitalizing instruction, and rejuvenating educational reform efforts for all American schools and students. Thus, the National Council on Education Standards and Testing endorses the adoption of high national standards and the development of a system of assessments to measure progress toward those standards.[32]

While the National Council's report received bipartisan support from Congress and the promise of David Kearns, Deputy Secretary of Education, that the Council's recommendations for the development of national standards would receive the full support of the U.S. Department of Education, the call for national standards was not met with enthusiasm in all quarters.[33]

Nevertheless, the recommendations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing seemed destined to get off the ground because they represented ideas whose time had come.[34] Many were calling for fundamental changes in education. Dwight W. Allen writes:

> ...now is an ideal time to consider a complete overhaul of the American educational system. Past reform efforts have tinkered with the system rather than changed it. 'Major' reform efforts have not been major at all - having been designed to work within the confines of the present obsolete system.[35]

For the first time in the history of American education a coordinated effort to set national standards in English, mathematics, science, geography, and history had the endorsement of Congress, the President, the Secretary of Education, and the nation's governors. In the center of this new effort to set national standards for teaching the core subjects was a mounting national concern about the learning status of all of America's children, especially the urban poor. Education was getting national attention. Maurice Berube says of the growing involvement of the national government and the American presidents in Education:

> ...Education in the nation responds to socioeconomic and political realities beyond the confines of the schoolhouse door. This fact has meant that government, especially the federal government - will be perceived by the public as the educational leader and will continue to assume that function...[36]

Interestingly, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics started developing national standards for mathematics as early as 1983. They came to the table not only prepared to advocate national standards, but also to present their own model.[37] Meanwhile, prior to the National Council on Education Standards and Testing report to Congress in January of 1992, a joint effort was announced by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the U.S. Department of Education to fund a nationwide project to develop content and performance standards in history for grades K-12.[38] Lynne V. Cheney, Chairman of NEH announced on December 16, 1991, that a grant had been awarded to the National History Standards Project, which was a cooperative

effort of the National Center for History in the Schools at the University of California at Los Angeles and NEH to develop the national history standards.[39] Observers of the process of setting national standards in the core subjects anticipated that it would be relatively simple to set such standards in mathematics, science and geography, but felt that setting national standards for English and history would be complicated and controversial in a society as ethnically and linguistically diverse as ours.

Rationale

When Charlotte Crabtree, Professor and Co-Director of the National Center for History in the Schools, University of California, Los Angeles, submitted her grant application to the National Endowment for the Humanities in November of 1991, she pointed out the work which had already been done toward setting national standards in mathematics and science. Noting that the work had been accomplished by a number of professional organizations working together to achieve consensus under the leadership of the Mathematical Sciences Education Board, Crabtree acknowledged that establishing consensus on national standards in history would be a difficult process. She said:

> ...at the core of much of this controversy is the question of the relative importance to be placed on ethnic diversity, identity, and plurality in our national history and on the binding values, ideals and democratic institutions that unify the nation and whose origins lie in the history of Western civilization.[40]

In her grant application, Crabtree also pointed out that there

had already been,

> ... a number of solid achievements of consensus building in history, demonstrating that important levels of agreement can be reached when effective leadership is established and a commitment is made to reasoned discourse and open dialogue among a broadly representative coalition of responsible parties assembled for that purpose.[41]

Crabtree cited two specific examples of successful attempts to build consensus in the area of history: one was the National Assessment of Education Progress, an organization which had successfully built a national consensus in its 1980 national assessment for history in grades 4, 8, and 12. The other was the consensus achieved in California, the most diverse state in the U.S., during the development and adoption of the 1988 History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve.[42] In the eyes of many Social Studies educators, the History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools is the primer of curriculum frameworks. The handiwork of a distinguished group of historians and educators, the document is unlike any others because it is written in a captivating style that allows the reader to capture the vision of the teaching of history in the schools. An ambitious project, the California History-Social Science Framework calls for the time for the teaching of history to be expanded to include a three year span of World history, a three year span of American history, and another year devoted to the study of the history of the state of California.

The crown jewel of the History-Social Science Framework is

its concept of curriculum strands which "are a constant in every grade."[43] Under the broad goal of knowledge and cultural understanding, these strands are Historical Literacy, Ethical Literacy, Cultural Literacy, Geographic Literacy, Economic Literacy, Sociopolitical Literacy. Under the goal of Democratic Understanding and Civic Values, the strands are National Identity, Constitutional Heritage, Civic Values, Rights and Responsibilities. Under the goal of Skills Attainment and Social Participation, the strands are Basic Study Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, and Participation Skills.

The History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools adopted in July, 1987, during the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution, is not without critics; it is, however, the most acclaimed framework of its kind, and it was a product of consensus building.

Consensus building was foremost in the vision articulated in Crabtree's successful grant application to NEH. With a network of support already in place and an impressive list of organizations and individuals who responded encouragingly to the idea of building a consensus for national history standards, Crabtree believed "...that a national consensus on K-12 standards can be achieved."[44]

When Crabtree announced that a national forum would convene to discuss the views of diverse groups regarding the "history that is most important for children to be taught,"[45] Francie Alexander, then Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and

Planning in the U.S. Department of Education and former director of the National Council for Education Standards and Testing, said of the diverse group nominated to begin the process of developing national standards for history, that this was the first time that scholars and state educators were coming to the table to discuss what we want our students to gain from history.[46] John J. Patrick, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science, expected that the most troublesome issue would be how the national standards for history would reflect the contributions of minorities and non-western cultures and religions.[47] From the first meeting of the Council on February 21, 1992, it became abundantly clear that a number of disparate issues would have to be resolved in order for a consensus on national history standards to be reached among the members of learned societies, historical organizations, teachers of history, professional organizations, policy makers, and curriculum specialists involved in the project.

Propositions

The variables considered in this study are expressed in the form of propositions. These propositions shaped the collection of data and helped organize this study. They are as follows:

1. Every effective organization has a well defined structure.
2. It is in the interest of any organization charged with the responsibility of overseeing a standards-setting process to include representatives of organizations who have a stake in the outcome of the process.
3. The completion of any serious task requires the

adherence to a reasonable timetable.

4. In an effort to set standards for the teaching of history, it is inevitable that a number of controversial issues be identified. The expected controversial issues will be related to content and process, inclusiveness, and the position of Western civilization in the world history curriculum.

5. In order to set standards for history efforts to build consensus will be expected of the participants.

6. Even under the most optimum conditions for consensus building, some issues will remain less than satisfactorily resolved.

7. The building of a consensus to set standards for history can become a model for other standards setting organizations.

Research Questions

To provide an answer to the problem of Building A Consensus for National History Standards, this research addressed the following specific research questions:

1. What was the organizational structure of the National History Standards Project.

2. Who was involved in the process of setting national standards for history?

3. What was the timetable by which the National History Standards Project anticipated completion of its task?

4. What were the controversial issues addressed by the National History Standards Project?

5. How was consensus built?

6. Which issues remain problematic?

7. How might the consensus building process of the National History Standards Project be applied to similar situations?

Definition of Terms

1. National Education Goals: the six goals agreed to by the President and the nation's governors.[48]

2. Core Subjects: English, mathematics, science, geography, and history, as indicated in the National Education Goals.[49]

3. National Council for Education Standards and Testing: a council created by Public Law 102-62 in response to interest in national standards and assessments by the nation's governors, the Executive branch and Congress.[50]

4. National History Standards: what students should know and be able to do. History standards are of three types: content, process and performance.[51]

5. National History Standards Project: a project administered by the National Center for History in the Schools, a cooperative UCLA/National Endowment of the Humanities Research Program, whose purpose is to develop and disseminate national achievement standards for United States and world history for the nation's schools.[52]

6. National Council for History Standards: the policy setting body responsible for providing policy direction and oversight of the project for setting National Standards for History.[53]

7. The National Forum for History Standards: an advisory body composed of representatives from 29 major educational, public interest, parent, business, and other organizations concerned with history in the schools.[54]

8. Focus Groups: eight groups with approximately 15 members each, chosen by the leadership of their respective organizations and contracted to provide important advisory, review and consulting services to the National Council for History Standards.[55]

9. Curriculum Task Forces: each composed of 15 experienced classroom teachers from throughout the United States, responsible for converting the Content Standards to grade appropriate performance standards and for developing teaching activities.[56]

10. Content Standards: standards setting "the knowledge, skills, and other necessary understandings that

schools should teach in order for all American students to attain high levels of competency in the subject matter."[57]

11. Performance Standards: standards establishing "the degree of quality of student performance in the challenging subject matter as set out in the content standards."[58]

12. Controversial Issues: issues "marked by opposing views ...disagreement or contention."[59]

13. Consensus: "general agreement; the judgement arrived at by most of those concerned."[60]

14. Inclusiveness: the notion that American history must reflect the contributions of all ethnic and racial minorities in the United States, as well as the contributions of women.

15. The Project: a brief reference to the National History Standards Project.

Limitations of the Study

As a Member of the Interim Council for Education Standards and Testing, the National Council for Education Standards and Testing, the History Task Force and the National Council for History Standards, this researcher has been an eyewitness and a participant in the process of developing national policy for national standards in education. Furthermore, as a member of the National Council for History Standards, this researcher knows and understands intimately the entire process of standards setting for history as it was implemented by the National History Standards Project. Most researchers encounter difficulties in accessing information and documentation from government agencies and organizations. This researcher has been fortunate to have had access to some of the most important players in the

development of public policy and especially the ones involved with the history standards. As a member of several important councils, this researcher has received solicited and unsolicited information from many major players in the standards setting process in the United States. In addition, by merit of being the 1989 National Teacher and also member of important councils and commissions, this researcher has been invited to and has attended many of the national conferences on standards and has been exposed to the testimonies and papers of the leaders in the field of standards. As a member of the organization which is the subject of the study, the researcher is fully aware of the potential of allowing personal biases to influence the findings of this study. The researcher acknowledges biases. Like any other serious researcher, this researcher began this study as the result of an interest. Having taught the social studies for over a quarter of a century, this researcher have an abiding interest in education generally and in history specifically.

One bias lies in the researcher's belief that one of the ways to upgrade the quality of American education is to develop national standards for each subject taught in our pre-collegiate institutions.

A second bias lies in the researcher's belief that history is the fundamental social science and that the teaching of history is one of the basic tools of literacy, as it links the student with all the other social sciences.

A third bias of the researcher lies in the conviction that

the teaching of the history of Western civilization must not be compromised. While advocating the teaching of an integrated world history, the researcher maintains that ideals of western civilization are the fundamental ideals upon which the United States built its institutions.

The researcher's participation as a member of the National Council for Education Standards and Testing and involvement in the National History Standards Project as a member of the National Council for History Standards must also be placed in the appropriate context.

First, the researcher participated in both of these positions gratis. Second, the success or failure of the National History Standards Project will have no material affect on the researcher. Third, participation in the National Council for History Standards has provided insights of great value which are not available to a researcher outside of the organization, and as such they enhance this research.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of pertinent literature and establishes a theoretical framework for conducting this research. The review of literature covers five areas: education reform, national standards, national history standards, controversial issues concerning the teaching of history, and selected literature in the area of conflict management for consensus building. In order to establish a background for understanding the controversies surrounding the teaching of history and to illuminate the need to build consensus toward the establishment of national standards for history, this chapter provides both an in-depth look at all areas and an especially focused review of the literature in the area of controversial issues concerning national standards and standards for the teaching of history.

### Educational reform

Since its inception, public education in the United States has been accompanied by controversy and calls for reform. Horace Mann, the father of American public school education, envisioned educational attainment as both a means of enlightenment and as a catalyst for permanently changing a society. Mann viewed education in terms of freedom, acquisition of property, cultivation of intelligence, and public virtue. He wrote:

> Education...beyond other devices of human origins, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery...it gives each man the independence and the means, by which he can resist the selfishness of other men. It does better than to disarm the poor of their hostility towards the rich; it prevents being poor...if this education should be universal and complete, it would do more than all things else to obliterate factitious distinctions of society.[61]

In the more than 200 years that American public education has existed, many calls for its reform have been issued. As emerging conditions in society necessitated change, public education was expected to usher in the necessary changes. Former New Jersey Governor Thomas Kean wrote that as early as 1818, Thomas Jefferson and a group of education commissioners looked to education as a vehicle for making people free. In an effort to develop a philosophy for the newly founded University of Virginia, they developed a set of goals which "included the advancement of the professions and industry" but they "...were more concerned with...civil leadership and individual virtue. To Jefferson, education's primary purpose was to teach the citizen to be free."[62] From Jefferson's view of education as a passport to freedom, to Horace Mann's call in 1848 to make "education in America free, secular, humane and universal", to the A Nation At Risk report in 1983 which lamented that America is at risk because of the poor status of the education of its children, the reformers' view of education has changed little over the years. The constancy of reform has been that when Americans become concerned with the future of their nation, they become concerned with the education of the citizenry to whom democracy entrusts

the power to govern. Writing to William C. James in 1820, Jefferson said:

> I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education.[63]

The various calls for reform of public education over the years have reflected social and economic conditions and the need to define who we are as a people. Wilson and Rossman says:

> Americans have a curious fascination with schooling as a powerful lever of social reform. Although there is often criticism of our schools, there is also eternal optimism that reforms in schools will right many of society's ills.[64]

In trying to define who we are as a people, Americans from time to time take another look at themselves and what they know. In The Moral Imagination and Public Life, Thomas E. McCollough says that our knowledge is bound up with our identity as members of our communities. "We are accountable to one another in the public realm for what we know and value as free and equal citizens."[65] When what we know does not seem to serve us well as a nation, we tend to reexamine those institutions responsible for the transmission of knowledge, and one of those is our schools.

Out of concern for America's position of power, productivity, and leadership in the international community, a public debate has raged in the 1980s and 1990s concerning school accountability. The 1983 A Nation At Risk report resurrected all the public and private concerns about education, and the calls



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for reform reached new heights. The National Commission on Excellence in Education issued several recommendations for educational reform including strengthening graduation requirements and adopting "...more rigorous and measurable standards and higher expectations for academic performance and student conduct..."[66] Furthermore, the Commission recommended that more time be devoted to the teaching of basic English, mathematics, science, social science, and computer mathematics. The Commission also recommended that teacher preparation be improved, that elected officials provide the leadership for reform, and that "...citizens provide the fiscal support and stability required to bring about the (proposed) reforms."[67]

In calling for immediate and long term reform of education, the National Commission on Excellence in Education concluded that "...it is by our willingness to take up the challenge, and our resolve to see it through, that America's place in the world will be either secured or forfeited..."[68]

Following the unveiling of A Nation At Risk, a reform movement began, urging change for American education. Chester E. Finn, Jr. wrote: "We are in the midst of an educational reform movement of epochal proportions. Its impetus comes not from the federal government or the profession but from the people."[69]

Dwight W. Allen, a proponent of experimental schools, felt that no time for educational reform was better than the present. Allen's vision for fundamental reform prompted him to propose the creation of "a national experimental schools network as a

framework for educational change, providing practical research and development.[70]

Terrel H. Bell, U.S. Secretary of Education, Emeritus, speaking at the College of William and Mary ten years after he introduced the nation to A Nation At Risk said:

> National standards...will emerge from the new idea hatcheries in Washington. Just as the state highway departments join the feds to set national standards for a national system of freeways, we will soon see a similar pattern for education. Just as the money from the Federal Highway Trust Fund flows to the states so long as they meet...the national standards they helped to adopt, a federal program to drive a nationwide school improvement program will appear on the scene.[71]

National Standards

The public call for education reform that accompanied A Nation At Risk rekindled a fervent debate over national standards. Though national standards were not a new idea, any attempt to set national standards just a few years earlier, would have been met with suspicion.[72]

Finn defined national standards as to mean:

> ...a sort of nationwide consensus regarding what an adequately educated American,...will know and be able to do on entry into adulthood. For me, this means a nationwide minimum, a core of knowledge and skills that everybody needs to have...These should not be just basic skills...they do not go nearly far enough...In writing I am talking about...the ability to write well enough to convey successfully that which you are trying to communicate. In math I am talking about NAEP's level 300..."[73]

Francie Alexander wrote that "standards for what students should know and be able to do are central to reinventing schools and transforming American education."[74] Lauren Resnick, Director of

the New Standards Project, said developing standards and assessments is crucial to the entire educational reform movement in order to assure coherence and high standards."[75]

The talk about standards often has become esoteric. According to Maxine Greene:

> It is with regard for contingency yes,. and for multiplicity and plurality, that I would argue for the kinds of standards that make possible an ongoing civil conversation, a dialogue that reconciles differences and that leads, with occasions open always for renewal to the constitution of a common world.[76]

Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot looked at standards from another point of view:

> I must confess that when I hear the words 'national standards' the images that spring to mind are ominous. I picture a remote, blunt set of institutional goals that are not responsive to variety or improvisation. I picture a faceless, impenetrable bureaucracy with which practitioners feel no sense of identification and connection. I picture a rigid set of criteria for mastery and achievement that are defined by a narrow, powerful segment of our population.[77]

The lines were drawn on all sides of the debate over setting national standards. The defenders linked national standards to such ideas as rigorous work, interdependence, achievement, excellence, and benchmarks. The opponents saw them as insensitive to diversity, as another means of exclusion, and as threatening to those students whose culture was different than the mainstream. While many reacted to the words national standards as if the nation had not had any standards before, others thought that the idea was overdue. Noah offered an international perspective on national standards:

> My basic position is straightforward. I believe that we in America need to steer away from our present

> antipathy toward nationally recognized standards in education. I believe we have gone overboard in the direction of local and state autonomy. In consequence, we have permitted de facto national standards to be set by private agencies such as textbook publishers and the Educational Testing Service.[78]

The proponents of national standards did not propose that setting national standards would be without problems and suggested caution in the move to adopt national standards. Harold J. Noah suggested that writing and implementing national standards should not be expected to be easy and neither should it be considered a panacea.[79]

While many educators and policy makers were enthusiastic about developing higher standards for education, there were many who became concerned that higher standards would become yet another obstacle to poor and disadvantaged children, children of new immigrants, children whose language was not English. Warren Simmons, Director of Equity Initiatives for the New Standards Project, disagreed saying, "If they [students] are not held to high standards by schools, they're certainly going to be held to high standards by employers, by their communities..."[80]

Many thought that national standards would be unfair to children if real help were not offered to their schools and teachers to help students meet the standards. Jerome S. Bruner expressed his skepticism when he wrote that asking people to meet standards without offering help is highly irresponsible.[81] Others looked at national standards as a route contrary to their version of reform. Deborah W. Meier, a celebrated teacher and principal, speaking at a symposium on National Standards for

American Education, often used the terms curriculum and standards as if they were one and the same and assumed a critical posture toward standards. Speaking about her own experience, Meier said she would not have developed her own school had she not been assured that she would be free from following the state-imposed curriculum.[82]

Many were criticizing the standards before they were written, assuming that standards would discourage critical thinking or making connections, or an interdisciplinary approach to teaching. These critics wrote the epitaph of the national standards before their birth and acted as if everything conducive to the best of learning could be found in maintaining the status quo. George Hanford, President Emeritus of the College Board, wrote:

> What today's misguided reformers would do is establish national standards, subject by subject, and then test students, subject by subject, to see if schools had succeeded in helping students achieve those standards and if the students had met them. Blinded by their good intentions, they fail to realize the negative long-range effects of what they are about.[83]

Elliot W. Eisner, professor of Education and Art at Stanford University, said that standards may not be the answer to improving education. Like many other critics of standards, Eisner feared that standards would teach children "...to replicate known answers or to mimic conventional forms."[84] Francie Alexander disagreed:

> ...Standards can unleash creativity and innovation. Students who used to sit in math classrooms and watch the teacher demonstrate one way to get the right answer now manipulate objects to reason through new mathematics

> concepts, do extended projects that require sophisticated mathematical understanding, and explore many ways to get a correct answer.[85]

John O'Neil expressed concern not about the call for national standards, which he considered as clear, but for the details of the development of national standards which he considered to be murky.[86] O'Neil outlined the similarities among the various standards-setting organizations. All such groups:

a. Intend to spell out the type of knowledge and skill, that all students should attain.

b. Feature a consensus-based process to shape their recommendations.

c. Have representatives of a broad range of stakeholders.

d. Send drafts of the standards for several iterations of comments and review.

O'Neil also noticed the differences among the projects. He mentions:

a. Too much or too little detail in the standards, a fact which could 'ensure a cold reception'.

b. The presence or absence of student performance standards.

c. The linking of some standards to curriculum, teaching and assessment and others simply focusing on curriculum.

d. The funding of standards setting projects with federal grants or the dependence of the project on foundation money and membership dues.[87]

Some educators criticized the standards movement as divisive. Denny Schillings, president of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) felt that "some have tried to pit the various disciplines against one another."[88] He further wrote that the NCSS standards which were developed independently

with funds provided by the NCSS would succeed:

> ...in providing a coordinated, systematic study drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology as well as appropriate content from the humanities, mathematics, and natural sciences."[89]

Negative reactions from educators regarding standards prompted David T. Kearns and Denis P. Doyle to write:

> ...to fail to hold students to high standards is an act of cynicism that a democracy cannot afford. It works a cruel hoax on the student, and leaves everyone the poorer for it.[90]

Despite its critics, the movement for national standards was solidly embedded in the national agenda. Henry Kierman and John Pyne write that "the movement for national standards is a broad-based movement supported by a variety of people representing all sections, classes, races, and political viewpoints."[91] Furthermore, the movement has been based on solid performance criteria for writing national content standards which should quell the worst fears of skeptics. Historian Paul Gagnon lists ten criteria for Content Standards Projects:

1. To establish a broad national consensus on subject matter content standards for students' outcomes.
2. To be consistent with the relevant recommendations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing.
3. To be led by the nation's recognized scholarly organizations and to reach genuine national consensus across regions through the participation of all affected parties.
4. To assemble a broadly inclusive advisory or governing board possessing the ultimate authority over the content standards statement to be issued.

5. To include in its advisory board and working teams representatives of scholars, users, and consumers.

6. To be designed and carried out by a tripartite alliance of equals: teachers, scholars, and specialists.

7. To examine all relevant prior work.

8. To produce a series of draft documents on content standards.

9. Directors of all projects to meet periodically to coordinate their work.

10. Documents to be so framed as to facilitate state and local construction of their own curricular frameworks.[92]

The public in general seemed to favor national standards. A public opinion poll showed that "most Americans" believed "that education reform would come with a national curriculum, national standards, national achievement tests, and the firing of teachers and principals whose schools do not show progress."[93]

In the meantime, national surveys continued to show that American students were not progressing academically in a satisfactory manner. In a 1991 survey assessing the preparation of high school students, the Harris Education Research Center stunned the nation with its survey results. Eight years after A Nation At Risk alarmed the American people about the status of education, the Harris poll found that high school graduates were poorly prepared in such basic skills as reading and understanding the written word and doing simple arithmetic. The study was sponsored by the Committee for Economic Development and co-sponsored by the Business Roundtable. It was endorsed by the National Education Goals Panel and the National Council on Education Standards and Testing. The study was funded by the Pew

Charitable Trusts.[94] The reaction of the nation was quick and pointed. Eight of ten Americans polled felt that "the United States will be incapable of competing economically in the world unless education achieves much higher standards in a hurry."[95] Roy Romer interpreted the poll as yet another indication of the need for national standards.

John F. Akers, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of IBM and chairman of the Business Roundtable Education Task Force, said in 1991 that "world class schools are a national imperative if we are to meet the challenge of an extremely competitive global economy."[96]

Two years later the 1993 Progress Report of the National Goals Panel was alarming:

> The sobering facts about our status in meeting the National Goals are a wake-up call to all Americans. At no stage in a learner's life - before schooling, during the school years, or as adults - are we doing as well as we should be or as well as we can. The nation has fallen behind its own expectations and behind the progress of our global competitors.[97]

The National Goals Panel concluded its haunting report by reminding Americans that:

> The National Education Goals and high education standards will help us prepare for crucial improvements in early childhood, schooling and workplace environments. We now have a vision of an American education system that rivals any other in the world. We simply need to get to work to make it happen.[98]

National History Standards

In 1988, the Bradley Commission on History in Schools issued its guidelines for teaching history, beginning with a resounding

statement about the place of history in our schools:

> History belongs in the school programs of all students, regardless of their academic standing and preparation, of their curricular track or of their plans for the future. It is vital for all citizens in a democracy because it provides the only avenue we have to reach an understanding of ourselves and of our society, in relation to the human condition over time, and of how some things change and others continue.[99]

This was not the first time that the case for history was made so clearly. In 1892, "the National Education Association appointed a distinguished Committee of Ten to examine the entire high school experience. The 1892 Subcommittee on History recommended that all students, whether or not they were college-bound, take four years of history on the secondary level. "History", it declared, "broadened and cultivated the mind, counteracted a narrow and provincial spirit, prepared students for enlightenment and intellectual enjoyment in after years, and assisted them to exercise a salutary influence upon the affairs of their country."[100]

Nearly 100 years later, The National Goals Panel placed history prominently in the third national goal which stated:

> By the year 2000, American children will leave grades four, eight,and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.[101]

Many social science educators rejected the singling out of history as one of the core subjects by the National Goals Panel while others placed history in perspective. C. Frederick

Risinger, writing on Current Directions in Social Studies, said that history, the "study of the human past, with all its triumphs and tragedies, is necessary to the understanding of contemporary society and the issues facing humankind."[102] Risinger went on to say that for three reasons history as it is taught today is very different from history as it was taught in the past:

a. History is combining political and military history with the story of the human endeavor.

b. Students studying history are learning about all people.

c. Students studying history must do more that acquire facts.[103]

For a long time, the concern has been mounting that history teaching in schools was declining. Historians wrote profusely about the need to study history. McNeill, Kammen, and Craig wrote:

> Historical knowledge is no more and no less than carefully and critically constructed collective memory. As such, it can make us both wiser in our public choices and more richly human in our private lives.[104]

Many were concerned about the declining understanding of such principles as fundamental as Democracy. Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles a joint statement of the American Federation of Teachers, the Education Excellence Network and Freedom House issued a call for America's schools:

> Our call for schools to purposely impart to their students the learning necessary for an informed, reasoned allegiance to the ideals of a free society rests on three convictions: First, that democracy is the worthiest form of human governance ever conceived. Second, that we cannot take its survival or its spread -or its perfection in practice - for granted...Third, we are convinced that democracy's survival depends upon our transmitting to each new generation the political vision

> of liberty and equality that unites us as Americans - and a deep loyalty to the political institutions our founders put together to fulfill that vision.[105]

E. D. Hirsch Jr. saw history as the discipline which tests in time all social ideas. Hirsch wrote that "the great test of social ideas is the crucible of history, which, after a time, usually discloses a one-sidedness in the best of human generalizations."[106] In Democracy's Half Told Story: What American History Textbooks Should Add, Paul Gagnon discusses the importance of history:

> We regard the study of history as the chief subject in education for democracy, much as Jefferson and other founders of the United States did two centuries ago. In revamping the social studies curriculum, we should start with the obvious: History is not the enemy of the social sciences, but is instead their indispensable source of nourishment, order, and perspective. We aim at nothing less than helping the student to comprehend what is important, not merely to memorize fact and formula. But it is clearly impossible to genuine comprehension of economic, political, social, and cultural questions without examining them in their historic context.[107]

Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash prefaced their work Lessons From History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire by writing:

> ...History in schools is in serious decline. Reports of students' distressingly low achievement levels in history on respected national assessments were matched by evidence that the time devoted to history in the schools had steadily declined to a state of genuine risk.[108]

The call for national education goals and national standards for teaching the core subjects gave impetus to the movement for the teaching of history in the schools. Lynne V. Cheney, Chairman of the National Endowment of the Humanities and a proponent of national standards and national assessments, wrote:

> The President and the governors have declared...that by the year 2000, all students should be competent in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography. Implicit in such goals...is the need to define what students should know and to assess how well they have learned it.[109]

The call to set national standards for history began with the National Council on Education Standards and Testing which was created by the Congress of the United States in 1991. The Council in turn created five task forces in the core disciplines of English, mathematics, geography, science, and history.

Chairing the History Task Force was Lynne V. Cheney. This researcher was a member of that Task Force. The Task Force met on October 23, 1991, at the Hyatt Regency in Washington D.C. in order to answer the National Council on Education Standards and Testing's five questions relating to the desirability and feasibility of national standards in history.[110] Briefly the History Task Force said:

a. The effort to develop national standards in history does not have to start from scratch but can build on previous work.[111]

b. National history standards should be voluntary, not too specific and should be derived by agreement on what is essential.

c. National history standards must be fair standards and will 'help the course of equity' by bringing attention to 'the need for equal resources to meet equal standards.'

d. National standards should be developed through a consensual process that allows various groups to be involved.[112]

e. National standards can be developed within two years of vigorous work.[113]

On November 5, 1991, Charlotte Crabtree professor and

director of the National Center for History in the Schools at the University of California, Los Angeles, submitted an application to the National Endowment for the Humanities seeking support for the Center's K-12 History Standards Project in order to continue its developmental and dissemination activities.[114] Crabtree wrote that the level of funding she was requesting would allow the center to continue its work by:

1. maintaining the Center's now well-established and highly successful program of service to the schools in the improvement of history teaching.

2. providing national leadership for the most challenging of the goals set forth in President Bush's national agenda, America 2000 and in the National Goals Program of the nation's governors - namely, developing through a national consensus process 'world class' achievement standards in history will...also serve as a powerful force for improving the history curriculum...as schools, districts, nationally, mobilize to prepare students to meet these new standards of excellence.[115]

On December 16, 1991, Cheney announced at the Old Post Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue:

> The National Endowment for the Humanities, in partnership with the Department of Education, will be supporting the National History Center for the next two years as the Center directs a national consensus process to establish world class standards for American students in history.[116]

It was apparent from the start that writing national standards for history would not be easy. Cheney, announcing the selection of the National Center for History as the recipient of the NEH grant, said:

> ...No one expects that the work of the History Center will be easy...history is a contentious discipline today...But just because history is a contentious discipline doesn't mean it is an intractable one. It is possible to set high

> standards in history. And the California History-Social Science Framework is the clearest evidence of that. It is possible for us to reach consensus on these matters. California has shown us the way. We can do it as a nation. High standards can be set, and our students deserve to have us work on them.[117]

Setting the tone of what was about to happen, the questions from the audience on December 16, were pointed. Wyatt Andrews from CBS wanted to know if the standards are the same as the curriculum which teachers would have to follow. Cheney, Governor Campbell and Governor Romer assured the reporter that standards were not curriculum, that standards would be used to gage the progress of states in reaching the national standards through their own curriculum and that standards were voluntary.[118]

Another questioner wanted to know how "history and multiculturalism would be assured and fused." Cheney replied that this would be accomplished by using as a model the California History-Social Science Framework. She assured the audience that the question is no longer whether we are going to teach multicultural history but whether we are going to do it well or do it badly.[119]

Yet another person asked whether the National Council for Social Studies would be included in the standards writing process. Answering that question, Crabtree said:

> ...The first group I called was the National Council for Social Studies, and they have come aboard. They're going to be involved in at least three different ways, and the President elect, Charlotte Anderson, will be sitting on the coordinating council...[120]

A reporter from Education Daily wanted to know about the consensus building process. Crabtree, outlining an anticipated

process which was expected to bring about a consensus approved document, expressed hope that the consensus would be established by November 1993.

Another reporter wanted to know if the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History had been contacted. Crabtree answered:

> No, it has not, and neither have a number of other groups that we are still in the process of reaching. And I appreciate you are bringing that group to my attention. There are others that we are still looking at and will be in touch with...[121]

Diane Ravitch, speaking on behalf of the Department of Education, expressed pleasure at the process and confidence in the leadership of Charlotte Crabtree, whose "genius for consensus-building" she praised.[122] Ravitch used a metaphor to explain the national standards setting effort, "I would think that what we're trying to do is to replace the rising tide of mediocrity with a rising tide that lifts all boats..."[123]

## Controversial Issues in History

In American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Schools, Lynne V. Cheney says:

> Cultural memory flourishes or declines for many reasons, but among the most important is what happens in our schools. Long relied upon to transmit knowledge of the past to upcoming generations, our schools today appear to be about a different task. Instead of preserving the past, they often disregard it, sometimes in the name of 'progress'...the belief that we can teach our children how to think without troubling them to learn anything worth thinking about...[124]

From the onset, it was apparent that one of the controversies in setting national standards for history would be

dealing with the question of content versus process. The issue of content and process is not a new one but it emerged anew during the debates regarding national standards. Even before one standard was written there were several assumptions related to content and standards which were regarded by many as gospel. Some of those assumptions were:

a. Standards are curriculum.

b. Standards in history will not be integrative.

c. Standards and critical thinking are incompatible.

d. Less (information) is more (information).
e. Standards are facts crammed into student's heads.

George Hanford, warned of the dangers to critical thinking should standards and national assessments become a reality:

> Basic to effective critical thinking is the ability to make connections, to bring to bear on an issue, a question, or a problem all the factors or influences that attend it. In a secondary school setting, this means the ability to apply one's knowledge in one subject in dealing with another...the very ability being developed in those surviving successful school reform efforts that emphasize interdisciplinary education...the same ability that will get short shrift if the proposers of national standards and national assessments get their way.[125]

Many looked at standards and the movement to emphasize a core of knowledge for each of the subjects designated in the National Education Goals as a conspiracy of sorts. Kiernan and Pyne commented on that perception when they wrote:

> ...national standards is not a 'neo-conservative' plot orchestrated by a coterie of Reagan-Bush zealots out to 'homogenize' our schools and indoctrinate our students with 'politically correct values.'"[126]

Hirsch addressed the question of core knowledge when he wrote:

> Any educational movement that avoids coming to terms with the specific contents of literate education or evades the responsibility of conveying them to all citizens is committing a fundamental error. However noble its aims, any movement that deprecates facts as antiquated or irrelevant injures the cause of higher national literacy. The old prejudice that facts deaden the minds of children has a long history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and includes not just the disciples of Rousseau and Dewey but also Charles Dickens who, in the figure of Mr. Gradgrind in Hard Times, satirized the teaching of mere facts. But it isn't facts that deaden the minds of young children, who are storing facts in their mind every day with astonishing voracity. It is incoherence - our failure to ensure that a pattern of shared, vividly taught, and socially enabling knowledge will emerge for our instruction.[127]

In test after test, American children did not seem to have the kind of knowledge that many felt was essential.

Many among the reformers believed that the teaching of history had declined so that many of the students in our nation's schools had little if any historical knowledge. In What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?, Ravitch and Finn found that only 51% of the students correctly answered chronology questions, 71.3% could correctly interpret maps and geography, 61.6% could correctly identify important people, 54.4% correctly answered questions about the Constitution, 58.2% correctly answered questions about Civil Rights, 58.3% correctly answered questions about International Affairs, and 49% correctly answered questions about the pre-national and colonial eras.[128]

While many educators and analysts expressed concern about such alarming information, there were others who found the very idea of teaching and testing students, on what they assumed to be just the recall of facts, alarming in itself. Critics of the

Ravitch and Finn study, What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know, had a lot to say. They blamed the format of the study. They thought it was senseless to look at the historic knowledge of 17-year-olds only. They thought it did not matter what was known, but whether one could think. Historical knowledge, they said, was not important in doing one's job, and they questioned the meaning of the term "shared heritage"[129] used by Ravitch.

According to one critic, the whole discussion about standards was diverting the nation's attention from the real problems. Margit McGuire, president of the National Council for Social Studies, wrote:

> ...testing and curriculum standards debates may serve as a smoke screen by redirecting our energies away from the issues that are systemic to our society and schools.[130]

Arguing against standards as late as February of 1992 as McGuire did, however, seemed to be a futile exercise. The need for standards was widely accepted by professionals, policy makers, and the public in general. Louis Harris in an Education Press Conference at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. on September 27, 1991, explained the results of what he called a landmark study on the status of U.S. education. After sharing the alarming statistics concerning the status of education, he summarized the findings of the study for the improvement of education:

> ...by 4 to 1, people feel not enough has been done to emphasize the importance of learning how to think. And the need for common standards. And that means not only standards of teaching, but also standards of performance by students. Thus, by 82-14%, a vast majority of the public and all groups are convinced there should be

> common standards that all schools should be expected to live up to.[131]

Other social studies educators took a more positive approach toward national standards for history and accepted the movement toward the establishment of national standards as one of the directions in which the social studies were heading. C. Frederick Risinger in Current Directions in Social Studies lists the following trends in teaching social studies:

a. More history and different history.

b. More geography and different geography.

c. Using literature to enrich social studies themes.

d. Focus on the multicultural nature of American history.

e. Renewed attention to western ideas in American society.

f. Renewed attention to ethics and values.

g. The role of religion in the study of history.

h. Attention to contemporary and controversial issues.

i. Covering issues in depth.

j. Writing, writing, and more writing.[132]

Explaining the focus of history on the multicultural nature of American society, Risinger wrote:

> ...A true multicultural perspective presents an accurate picture of all of the many different groups that comprise our pluralistic society. Students should be learning about the beliefs and goals that bind us together. Our national motto, e pluribus unum - from many, one -forms the basis of a realistic and beneficial multicultural education.[133]

While Risinger put multiculturalism into perspective, others would argue that multiculturalism was an issue of inevitable controversy facing the National History Standards Project. In

the last decade, multiculturalism had either been seriously discussed, thus enlightening people, or had been tossed carelessly around infuriating or fanaticizing others.

Multiculturalism was part of a culture war which was enveloping America and the schools were not neutral grounds. James Davison Hunter, in his book Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America, offers an explanation for the reasons that the contemporary culture war has entered the realm of education:

> The education of the public at every level - from elementary school through college - is not a neutral process of imparting practical knowledge and technical skills. Above and beyond that, schools are the primary institutional means of reproducing community and national identity for succeeding generations of Americans. This is where we first learn and where we are continually reminded with others of our generation - through courses on history, geography, civics, literature, and the like - what it means to be an American. Thus, when the meaning of our identity as Americans is contested, as it is in the contemporary culture war, the conflict will inevitably reach the institutions that impact these collective understandings to children and young adults.[134]

In The Critique of Multiculturalism, Hunter writes:

> The multicultural credo and program, critics say, is a sham. The 'diversity' its advocates celebrate, they say, is not a true diversity. After all, its advocates rarely if ever propose courses in Irish Catholic, Greek American, Asian American, Jewish, or Protestant Fundamentalist studies. Rather their idea of diversity is defined by political criteria - namely, the presumed distinction between 'oppressors and oppressed'...Even those who are willing to accept the challenge to open up university education to a broader range of cultural experiences complain bitterly about the methods used to bring this goal about...[135]

Under the title Counter Charges, Hunter offers the progressionist response to the critics of multiculturalism.

> In the final analysis, say those holding to the progressive vision, the public should not be misled.

> The critics of the multicultural innovations...are themselves motivated by political ideals - the same repressive assumptions that undergird the university system and American society as a whole.[136]

The authors of Civitas also addressed the issue of multiculturalism as it relates to civic education. They searched for words of wisdom from respected Americans in our nation's past. Among others, they quoted Theodore Roosevelt who said:

> The one absolutely certain way of bringing this nation to ruin, of preventing all possibility of its continuing to be a nation at all would be to permit it to become a tangle of squabbling nationalities...each preserving its separate nationality.[137]

Fredric Smoler, prefacing an interview with historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr., wrote:

> In 1987, a sweeping revision of the social studies program in New York State public schools gave the curriculum a strong multicultural slant. It was not strong enough, however, for a task force on minorities appointed by Thomas Sobol, the state education commissioner, in 1989. This task force rendered a report that included an immediately notorious assertion: 'Afro-Americans, Asian Americans, Puerto-Ricans, Latinos and Native Americans have all been the victims of an intellectual and educational oppression that has characterized the culture and institutions of the United States and the European American world for centuries. This 'Eurocentric' approach had allegedly instilled an ugly arrogance in students of European descent.[138]

A profusion of literature condemning or affirming such views followed the publication of the report. In response to public outcry, Sobol appointed a new commission to reexamine the social studies curriculum of New York schools. Writing about the new committee, Newsday's editorial expressed hope that this new committee would avoid the pitfalls of the 1989 task force. In part it said:

State Education Commissioner Thomas Sobol and most regents

> wisely want to avoid the anti-white sentiments expressed in the 1989 task force report on multiculturalism...It was tainted by the worst of an important movement against 'Eurocentric' bias, in which some marginal academics have hawked crackpot theories of African and American history... The new state committee hasn't escaped such influences. One member, African Studies Professor Ali Al'Amin Mazrui of SUNY Bringhampton has written that 'the decline of Western Civilization might well be at hand. It is in the interest of humanity that such a decline should take place' ...Fortunately, the committee also includes such eminent scholars as Nathan Glazer,...Kenneth Jackson and...Edward Gordon. Historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. will advise them. They know - and children must learn - that the West has produced not just oppression but also precious gains in human rights.[139]

In 1991, the commission issued its report and, although it was more moderate in its tone, it "recommended that the social studies curriculum for the 2.5 million schoolchildren of New York be revised once again to place greater emphasis on the role of non-white cultures."[140]

The 1991 report entitled One Nation, Many People: A Declaration of Cultural Independence included position papers from members of the commission. It was apparent that the work of the commission was not derived by consensus. In a statement the co-chairpersons E. W. Gordon and F. Roberts wrote:

> The committee does not have a consensus position of these issues, but it seems that these concerns are important enough to be part of the continuing discourse concerning the place of attention to cultural and other sources of human diversity in the social studies curriculum.[141]

The reflective report of Gordon and Roberts sent an ominous message about the complexity of the issues facing those who want to build a consensus to create frameworks, standards, and goals for the teaching of history.

Nathan Glazer, in his comments as a member of the commission

also indicated the lack of consensus:

> Within the broad spectrum that remains after the extremes have been rejected, the report points out a very general direction, rather than specifies the details of a syllabus or curriculum. It continues a debate, rather than concludes it.[142]

Kenneth T. Jackson, another member of the commission, wrote a dissenting comment lamenting the lack of consensus:

> Certainly, we should acknowledge that heterogeneity has made this land rich and creative. Certainly we should give our students a varied and challenged multicultural education. Just as certainly, we should celebrate the common culture that Americans share. Unfortunately, our report seems to disparage 'Anglo conformity'...I would argue that it is politically and intellectually unwise for us to attack the traditions, customs, and values which attracted immigrants to these shores, in the first place... Unfortunately our document has virtually nothing to say about the things which hold us together.[143]

Another committee member Ali A. Mazrui saw multiculturalism as the agenda for change:

> A far bigger question which now arises is how this country, how this greater microcosm of the human race on earth, can also become the greater epitome of world culture in history. How can the United States succeed in capturing some of the rich cultural diversity of the nationalities represented in its population?...The place to begin is the school. The agenda is multiculturalism.[144]

Diane Glover, another member of the committee, submitted a paper on The Need to Examine the Origin of Racism and its Relationship to Skin-Color Devaluations. She said:

> The topic of racism can no longer be a taboo, if we want an effective multicultural curriculum. The educational community (Giant Step, Head Start, Day Care, community and cultural institutions, colleges and universities, libraries, parents and public school personnel) need informational and training sessions that address racism and its relationship to skin color devaluation....they need to know the role of European scholarship in promoting psychological and historical inferiority.[145]

Arthur Schlesinger Jr., consultant to the committee, wrote a dissenting opinion:

> Debate, alternative interpretations, 'multiple perspectives' are all essential to the educational enterprise. I welcome changes that would adapt the curriculum to these purposes. If that is what the report means by multicultural education, I am all for it. But I fear that the report implies much more than this. The underlying philosophy of the report...is that ethnicity is the defining experience for most Americans, that ethnic ties are permanent and indelible, that the division into ethnic groups establishes the basic structure of American society and that a main objective of public education should be the protection, strengthening, celebration and perpetuation of ethnic origins and identities...The ethnic interpretation reverses the historic theory in America - which has been, not the preservation and sanctification of old cultures and identities, but the creation of a new national culture and a new national identity. As Secretary of State John Quincy Adams told a German contemplating migration to these shores, those who would settle to America must recognize one necessity:
> 'They must cast off the European skin, never to resume it. They must look forward to their posterity rather than backward to their ancestors.'[146]

Mario M. Cuomo wrote a Response to the Social Studies Committee and offered his views about diversity, the curriculum, and the dangers of factionalism:

> Our first guiding principle must be that we do not have to choose between fostering common American values and recognizing and encouraging an enriching diversity. I agree first and foremost with those who contend that the core of multicultural education - as with public education - must be the fostering of common values and ideas that tie us together as a nation. At the same time I disagree with those who argue or suggest that the strength of ethnic identity is in some way opposed to a common understanding of what it means to be an American.[147]

Cuomo warned:

> It would be a disgrace if this debate were reduced to a contest for our worst instincts, with one side claiming the other was not 'American' enough, while the other returned fire charging that their accusers want to stamp out the heritage of the growing numbers of African-American, Hispanic and Asian voters. This discussion should start

and end with the educational interest of our children.[148]

Cuomo's concerns were taken up by others. Diane Ravitch, an education historian, wrote that the various controversies affected public education positively and negatively. When a controversy has unhappy outcomes the schools suffer:

> ...textbooks suffer as does instruction, when publishers remove literary selections with myths or fables or themes that offend someone...history instruction is distorted when pressure groups exert political pressure on teachers, textbook publishers and school board members to have the past taught their way.[149]

Ravitch, who sees multiculturalism as a "necessity," further suggested that "cultural diversity in the classrooms of our nation has created a growing demand for school programs that reduce prejudice and teach children to appreciate others whose race and ethnicity are different from their own."[150] Ravitch contends that, unlike the pluralist multiculturalists who seek inclusiveness and respect for each other, particularist multiculturalists "neglect the bonds of mutuality that exist among people of different groups and encourage children to seek their primary identity in the cultures and homelands of their ancestors."[151]

In the meantime, the issue of what history to teach was gaining prominence on the editorial pages of many newspapers and journals and became the subject of public speeches. "Afrocentrists wage war on Ancient Greeks" was the headline the Wall Street Journal gave to an article in which Mary Lefkowitz objected to the version of history promoted by Yosef A.A. ben-Jochannan in a lecture at Wellesley College. Commenting on

Afrocentric historians Lefkowitz wrote:

> These [historians] are determined to show that Africa is the true mother of Western civilization, and that Greek philosophy and religion were not invented by the Greeks but rather stolen by them from the ancient Egyptians. They depict the Egyptians and other ancient peoples of Africa as victims of a conspiracy...[152]

Eva T. H. Brann, speaking on Liberal Education and Multiculturalism, called multiculturalism an uninclusive term. She said: "Not all cultures are equally entitled by current multi-culturalists." Further she said:

> The aim of the multiculturalists that turn up in the news are not stated in a liberal mood. Their purpose in introducing multiculturalism into the curricula, from kindergarten to college, is to foster, cultural identity and racial or ethnic self-esteem, not for all cultures but only for those that have victim credentials and also some political clout... Inclusive multiculturalism poses enlivening problems for liberal education, but exclusive multiculturalism is a deadly enemy.[153]

The experience of the New York State Social Studies Review and Developmental Committee and the product of their work, One Nation, Many Peoples: A Declaration of Cultural Diversity was different than the experience of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee for History Scope and Sequence and the History-Social Studies Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee.

Shaped over a two year period, the California History-Social Science Framework was derived by consensus. Prefacing the framework, the managers of the project wrote:

> ...Five hundred and fifty copies were sent to selected teachers, administrators, school districts, and offices of county superintendents of schools that represented California's diverse geography and population; to colleges and university scholars nationwide; and to other educators from many states. The field review produced 1,700 responses ...as a result of the field reviews, numerous changes and

some additions were made to the document.[154]

The revised draft of the History-Social Studies Framework was unanimously approved by the California Curriculum Commission and after further revision, the document was adopted unanimously by the State Board of Education.[155]

While praise came from many quarters, the California History- Social Studies Framework was not without its critics. In "Diane Ravitch and the Revival of History: A Critique," Ronald W. Evans said:

> The new California framework institutes forms of knowledge that support dominant interests in our society. Specifically, the framework inculcates 'principles of democratic government' and emphasizes knowledge of Western culture...Unfortunately, the framework devotes little or no direct attention to competing ideologies...[156]

Caught up in the curriculum controversies in California were also the textbook companies. The Boston Globe wrote:

> The venerable Houghton Mifflin, long viewed as a bastion of traditional Yankee culture, set out to write a 'multi-cultural' elementary and middle school social studies series that would eschew the so-called Eurocentric approach common to textbooks...But the Houghton Mifflin textbooks praised by many educators - also have run into a buzzsaw of criticism...Critics...complain that changes made by Houghton Mifflin in response to their concerns have been cosmetic... 'Europe is eulogized at the expense of the rest of us,' said Mary Hoover, a professor of black studies, ...'In general people of color are denigrated.'[157]

Criticism of the Houghton Mifflin series was not only concerned with exclusion, but also with how minorities were portrayed and included. Besides comments on the inclusion of minorities, criticism also came from conservatives who objected to the textbook's lack of traditionalism.[158]

The public discourse about what view of history should

prevail in the nation's schools loomed heavy over the announcement by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Endowment of the Humanities that a $1.6 million grant was being given to the National Center for History in the Schools to develop national standards for history. Charlotte Crabtree upon accepting the grant acknowledged:

> ...the breadth and diversity of current research in history could make it difficult to set standards that are widely agreed upon. But...defining a common core of knowledge that all American students should possess was not impossible.[159]

Other historians agreed with Crabtree. Historian Gary Nash saw multiculturalism as an "opportunity to teach kids an inclusive history that will promote mutual respect among people of different religious and cultural backgrounds."[160] But Nash also believed that multiculturalism had a better chance to succeed:

> ...in bringing about a greater openness and sympathy if we can all keep returning to some common values and political ideals that we share. No curriculum reform can stand in isolation of the social and political world around it. If that world is so deeply fractured that you have no common ground, then multiculturalism will fail.[161]

The recognition that America's story must include the story of all its people was not the issue by the 1990s. By then, the imperative was to not shirk the difficult issues and to not allow history to become a tool of propaganda. Historian Bernard Lewis, an advocate of the study of history of "other people," a critic of the way Western people often told the history of others, an advocate of the idea that historians in free societies have additional responsibilities, says:

> We, as historians in free countries have a moral and professional obligation not to shirk the difficult issues and subjects that some people would place under a sort of taboo; not to submit to voluntary censorship, but to deal with these matters fairly, honestly, without apologetics, without polemic, and of course, competently ...We live in a time when great efforts are being made to falsify the record of the past and to make history a tool of propaganda; when governments, religious movements, political parties and sectional groups of every kind are busy rewriting history as they would wish it to have been, as they would like their followers to believe it to have been...[162]

Historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. also expressed concern about the attempt to manipulate public school curriculum. He cited the reasons why manipulation of the curriculum might occur and expressed confidence that the majority of the people won't stand for it:

> What is more worrying is the attempt to manipulate the public school curriculum. Several factors are at work there. Education is a mess, resources are strained, and manipulating the curriculum doesn't cost very much... Phenomena like excessive bilingualism and the so-called Afrocentric curriculum are worrying. But even there I think most Hispanic kids want to learn English and most blacks regard themselves as Americans, not Africans.[163]

In an interview with Fredric Smoler, Schlesinger said:

> We have always been a multiethnic society. Americans have been absorbed with diversity from the eighteenth century on...even the national motto, E PLURIBUS UNUM, explicitly refers to it.[164]

The New York State United Teachers conducted a survey to measure the attitudes of the public on the debate over multicultural education in New York State. They found that three out of four residents of New York considered teaching history from the perspective of what they called the "Common Heritage and Values That We Share As Americans" was a very important goal of

public education. The survey also found that 45% of the residents responded that teaching history from the "Separate Histories" perspective was very important and that 35% of the residents found that perspective somewhat important. While over half of white New Yorkers said that teaching history from the Common Heritage perspective is most important 1/3 of black and Hispanic residents rated Common Heritage as the most important perspective.[165]

While the controversies concerning how to teach history and what history to teach were going on, many social studies teachers in the U.S. were informed about the issues by the NCSS, the organization which has the highest membership of pre-collegiate social studies teachers. The National Council for Social Studies devoted most of the September 1992 issue of the Social Education Journal to the issue of multicultural education. James A. Banks, the author of Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education identified three groups which participated in the "contentious debate among educators about the extent to which the curriculum should be revised to reflect ethnic and cultural diversity."[166] He called the three groups the Western traditionalists, the Afrocentrics and the multiculturalists.

Banks offered curriculum guidelines for multicultural education that would permeate the entire school environment with an ethos of ethnic and cultural diversity, rather than a curriculum guideline in its traditional meaning of providing direction as to the content of such a curriculum.[167]

Gloria Ladson-Billings, writing in the same issue of Social Education under the title "The Multicultural Mission: Unity and Diversity," divided the advocates of multiculturalism into multicultural illiterates and multicultural competents.[168] Multicultural illiteracy, according to Ladson-Billings, "is the inability to be conversant with basic ideas, issues, personalities, and events that reflect perspectives and experiences other than those of the dominant culture..."[169]

Point by point, Ladson-Billings defined her perception of the weaknesses of the multicultural illiterates and the strengths of the multicultural competents. Ladson-Billings attacked the concern of "multicultural illiterates" over how to have unity with diversity. She called such a concern "a red herring, designed to deflect our attention away from the more critical issue of how to maintain unity in the face of huge and growing economic disparity."[170]

Others were more optimistic about the place of multiculturalism in the curriculum. Robert K. Fullinwider envisioned multicultural education becoming "enlisted in the school's civic mission."[171] Fullinwider writes:

> ...as the nation becomes more ethnically, religiously, and culturally diverse, and as new groups assert themselves, the capacity of citizens to deliberate about the differences among us takes on greater urgency and faces greater barriers.[172]

Fullinwider expressed hope that multiculturalism would be included in the discussion of ethnic and cultural pluralism by Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education, the project of the

Center for Civic Education and the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, which have undertaken the task of developing standards for civic liberty.[173]

The looming question remained: could national standards for history be written in the face of such controversies about the teaching of history? Rochelle L. Stanfield, writing for the National Journal, posed the question which was in many people's minds: whose history should children learn? Stanfield quoted a Seattle school system administrator whose division had gone through the divisiveness and bitterness of multiculturalism in the 1970s. The administrator May Sasaki said, "You can't entirely skip the polarization, it's the process of people going through that and seeing that it doesn't work."[174] Stanfield questioned "whether development of national history standards can wait for that process to take place."[175]

The extended debates on multiculturalism seemed destined to pose at least two major controversial issues in the process of writing national standards for history:

a. How to include minorities in the American History curriculum.

b. Where to place Western civilization in the world history curriculum.

Debra Viadero from Education Week, writing about the diverse group which was put together to develop standards for history, commented on the anticipated controversies:

> If the new standards-setting process resembles the efforts already completed in California and New York... There will likely be controversy over the extent to which it reflects the contributions of minorities and non-Western

cultures and religions.[176]

Charlotte Crabtree, whose experience in curriculum writing and standards-setting was extensive, anticipated difficulties but was optimistic. In her proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities, she alluded to the debates over the issues of multicultural education, ethnic separation, and the commemoration of the Columbian Quincentennial:

> At the core of much of this controversy, is the question of the relative importance to be placed on ethnic diversity, identity, and plurality in our national history and on the binding values, ideals, and democratic institutions that unify the nation and whose origins lie in the history of Western civilization.[177]

Crabtree acknowledged that in the presence of all the debates concerning diversity, the teaching of history, would seem to be difficult to resolve. However, she remained optimistic:

> ...the advocates of extreme positions...have achieved enormous press coverage...Countering these voices, however, have been a number of solid achievements of consensus building in history, demonstrating that important levels of agreement can be reached when effective leadership is established and a commitment is made to reasoned discourse and open dialogue among a broadly representative coalition of responsible parties assembled for that purpose.[178]

Building Consensus

The need to build a broad consensus was central to Crabtree's proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities. Explaining the timing of the National History Standards Project, Crabtree focused on the need for consensus building. Hoping that the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) consensus project whose purpose was to prepare the framework for the 1994 National Assessment in United States History would be nearing

completion in May 1992, and would be available to the working groups of the National History Standards Project, she wrote:

> ...Should it prove impossible...to reach consensus on history standards by November 1993, the remaining months of winter, and Spring 1994, would then be devoted to further work to bring all parties into consensus before June 1994. To ensure that the process of consensus building is widely perceived to be a genuinely collaborative effort of interested parties, with the History Standards nationally accepted in the end as an authoritative statement on which national assessment programs can be based, we propose to develop a consensus process that includes a wide variety of interested parties. Included will be distinguished scholars in United States and world history; experienced history teachers from all levels of precollegiate education, elementary through high school; professional organizations in history education and the social studies; school supervisors, administrators and state chief school officers; representatives of the National School Boards Association, The Education Commission of the States and the National Parent Teacher Association; state legislators; and other interested groups.[179]

In fact, Crabtree referred to the National History Standards Project throughout her application to the National Endowment for the Humanities as "the consensus building process"[180] and paid attention to the composition of each of the participating groups in order to ensure geographic, ethnic, gender, urban, inner-city and other diversity.[181]

Consensus building was also of primary concern in another product of the National Center for History in Schools, Lessons From History: Essential Understanding and Historical Perspectives Students Should Know. In the preface to that book Crabtree and Nash, editors, said of the volume's contents:

> These are the central questions this volume has addressed, arguing first the rationale on which this search was undertaken; confronting next some very real constraints of classroom time and feasibility with which teachers presently must cope; and turning, finally, to the task of working toward

> consensus on what of United States and world history is of central importance for students to understand by the time they graduate from high school.[182]

Further on, Crabtree and Nash reaffirmed the nature of the report. "This is a consensus report"[183] produced with the collaborative effort of many groups, they wrote.

The importance of building consensus was included in practically every announcement made about national standards for history and in every article written about national standards. Carol Innerst of the Washington Times, covering the ceremony of the announcement of the grant by the National Endowment for the Humanities to the National Center for History in the Schools, wrote "Charlotte Crabtree, director of the National Center for History, will oversee the work of seeking a national consensus on what students should know..."[184]

Speaking on the same occasion, Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander also referred to building consensus as he first praised Governors Romer and Campbell, Chairmen of the National Council for Education Standards and Testing when he said:

> I want to congratulate Governors Campbell and Romer, because they are leading a large group of elected officials and educators who are trying to see whether in this great big complex nation of ours we can come to a consensus about what world class standards are in math, science, English, history, and geography.[185]

Alexander also mentioned consensus building when he commented at the grant announcement ceremony on the work which was expected to come out of UCLA's Center for History in Schools. Alexander said that this grant was about:

> ...building on some important work that Charlotte Crabtree

> and others have done before to see if we can come to a *consensus about what American children ought to know* about our own history and the history of other major civilizations of the world.[186]

Others also addressed the concept of consensus building.

In A Historian's Viewpoint, Gary Nash wrote about the consensus building process:

> The National Council for History Standards...has many talented historians on it, and they have...given much time to the infinitely complex-and politically contentious - questions of how history is best studied, how much of it ought to be studied, how teachers can best approach the vast amounts of historical scholarship generated in the last half-century, and what is most essential for students to understand. It is encouraging that the two largest historical bodies--the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association--are participating fully in the history standards project, as is the National Council for History Education and a number of other historical groups and groups representing allied disciplines. As drafts of U.S. and world history standards are written ...the National Council for History Standards will be consulting fully with all of these groups in order to build a broad-based consensus regarding the kinds of history our young people should be studying.[187]

Elaine Reed, executive secretary of the National Council for History Education whose organization was one of the focus groups, also referred to consensus building by the group when talking about the world history group's discussions about periodization for world history: "after discussion, there was a consensus that this was an appropriate periodization for World History."[188] Reed also said of the National History Standards Project, "the whole idea of the project is to get as much input and consensus as possible as to what it is that our students should know and be able to do in a world history."[189]

Identifying ten criteria for National Content Standards

Projects, Paul Gagnon prominently listed consensus building as the first criterion:

> The purpose of each project is to establish a broad national consensus on subject matter content standards for students' outcomes: what should students know and be able to do from their K-12 study of the given subject?"[190]

Consensus seeking seemed an imperative not only for standards in a subject matter as contentious as history, but for standards in general. Finn, writing about national educational standards, said: "What I mean is a sort of nationwide consensus regarding what an adequately educated young American...will know and be able to do on entry into adulthood."[191]

In its report, the National Council for Education Standards and Testing concluded that a broad consensus would be required to raise standards for American education:

> The National Education Goals Panel has called upon America to become a nation of learners. National standards and assessments linked to them, developed through a broad consensus process, are a critical next step in revitalizing American education.[192]

Francie Alexander discussed building consensus for all standards projects when she said:

> The U.S. Department of Education is supporting projects to develop voluntary national standards in the subjects of science, history, the arts, civics, geography, and English. The standards are being developed in a manner that encourages the broadest participation possible in order to build consensus on what our students should know, be able to do, and be like.[193]

Seeking consensus was something the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics knew much about since mathematics was the first discipline to develop national standards. In a statement to the National Council on Education Standards and Testing,

Jeremy Kilpatrick said:

> There is a remarkable degree of consensus in professional groups in mathematics education that the standards, whatever flaws they might have, are pointed in the right direction... Those who developed the standards deserve credit for seeking and making use of suggestions from many people in the mathematics educational community.[194]

Management of Conflict for Consensus Building

A search of pertinent literature was done, to investigate the way in which organizations and groups of individuals deal with controversial issues and manage the process of consensus building. The investigation focused on the methods and techniques recommended by experts to negotiate differences without compromising sustaining values in order to bring about general agreement or broad consensus. Another focus of the search was to select a theoretical model of conflict resolution suitable for the analysis of the study data.

Bruce L. Wilson and Gretchen B. Rossman in Mandating Academic Excellence: High School Responses to State Curriculum Reform discuss the need for a framework within which reform can take place. They identify four dimensions necessary to the framework for reform: the technical dimension of policy reform which focuses attention on the knowledge and skills required to accomplish certain objectives. The cultural dimension which captures the values, beliefs and norms of the organization. The moral dimension which draws out the principles of justice and fairness embedded in policy reform, and the political dimension of reform which:

> ...embraces questions of influence, power, and authority, as well as conflict and negotiation within the organization... The political frame highlights how conflict is managed and compromise or integrative solutions reached. The essence of this frame is that multiple perspectives - and demands - are always brought to bear in the decision-making process and that different forms of negotiation are used to produce a decision...The political frame draws attention to the various and sometimes conflicting views on the aims of education... When a vision is shaped, conflict is likely as a groups and individuals offer alternatives...The political frame acknowledges the legitimacy of these claims and provides an orderly process for discussion and agreement.[195]

The level of intensity with which history standards were discussed made it obvious to even the most casual observer that conflict management principles and skills would be required to carry out the National History Standards Project. The conflict resolution literature provides several definitions and theoretical models for conflict resolution. Jack N. Porter and Ruth Taplin, writing about new theoretical approaches to conflict, explain the method of negotiation, a new approach in the area of resolution of conflict. Negotiation, they write, is "communication between two or more parties that communicate for the purposes of influencing each other's decision."[196]

A major new theoretical model of conflict resolution is what the authors refer to as "principled negotiation."[197]

> Principled negotiation deals with recognizing the joint goals of the parties to come to an agreement without sacrificing either substantive gain or the relationship and with dealing with both these aspects of the negotiation on their merits...Principled negotiators focus on principles, common interests, the multiplicity of available options and objective criteria which help define merits making them tangible to the parties. The theory of principled negotiation proposes that if the parties involved argue about interests and objective criteria rather than positions, many positive benefits to dispute resolution will follow such as clearer communication, greater understanding, inventiveness, a

better chance for reality testing of options and a much stronger relationship that avoids the need for face-saving.[198]

Principled negotiation is based on four points:

a. Separate people from the problem to avoid personality clashes.

b. Focus on the interests rather than the positions in a negotiation. (Positions are the ideas that people have about an issue, while interests are the desires and concerns of the parties.)

c. Invent options that are mutually acceptable to all parties.

d. Base options on objective criteria that deal with the merits of the problem.[199]

To improve the negotiation process the parties involved must pay attention to the issue of power which is often inequitable thus influencing the outcomes of negotiation in favor of the more powerful party.

The authors describe categories of power:

a. Power of skill and knowledge.

b. Power as a result of a good relationship between the negotiating parties.

c. Power as the result of an alternative option that is not dependent on the party with whom one is negotiating.

d. Power of creating a great number of options so that the possibilities of meeting the legitimate interests of both parties are heightened.

e. Power to adhere to legitimate standards that are persuasive to the other party, standards which are consistent with precedence or expert advice.[200]

Thomas C. Schelling, author of The Strategy of Conflict, discusses the theory of interdependent decision whereby in some situations such as traffic jams, negotiations, strikes and

maneuvering in a bureaucracy, "mutual dependence is part of the logical structure and demands some kind of collaboration or mutual accommodation..."[201] Writing national standards for history was not unlike moving through a traffic jam; neither was it unlike maneuvering in a bureaucracy. Neither one could be accomplished by force of will alone. While various theories were proposed as viable choices for navigating through controversies, compromising just to reach a solution was not considered a viable strategy. Cheryl Hamilton, author of Communicating for Results writes:

> ...sometimes it is impossible to reach a consensus agreement, and compromise...is necessary to reach a solution. However, keep in mind that settling for just any solution could be worse than no solution.[202]

Hamilton recommends that when a stalemate has been reached, the leaders of groups must follow the following steps before they yield to a compromise:

a. Clarify the situation to the group with clear language.

b. Urge the group to set the conflicting solutions aside temporarily, proceed with the rest of the work.

c. Guide the group to seek new solutions through brain-storming.

d. Guide the group in comparing the original incompatible solutions with the new ones in order to decide which one is best.

According to Hamilton, following these four steps saves a group from accepting a compromise, because it is not necessary to make concessions to reach a consensus agreement.[203]

Another way to look at the strategy of cooperation or reaching broad consensus is the way Robert Axelrod looks at the

theory of cooperation. Using the U.S. Senate as an example of the theory of cooperation, Axelrod says:

> In the case of a legislature such as the U.S. Senate, this proposition says that if there is a large enough chance that a member of the legislature will interact again with another member, there is no one best strategy to use independently of the strategy being used by the other person. It would be best to cooperate with someone who will reciprocate that cooperation in the future, but not with someone whose future behavior will not be very much affected by this interaction. The very possibility of achieving stable mutual cooperation depends upon there being a good chance of a continuing interaction...as it happens in the case of Congress.[204]

Christopher W. Moore, author of The Mediation Process, discusses intervention and proposes "a framework of explanatory causes and suggested interventions."[205] According to Moore, most conflicts have multiple causes, and the principal task of the parties involved in the conflict and the mediator is to identify the causes of the conflict and take action to alleviate them.[206]

Moore categorizes conflicts into:

a. Interest conflicts caused by perceived or actual content or procedural interests.

b. Structural conflicts caused by unequal control or unequal power among members of a group.

c. Value conflicts caused by differences in ideas, behaviors, goals, or religions.

d. Relationship conflicts caused by strong emotions, misperceptions and poor communication.

e. Data conflicts caused by different views and different interpretations of what is relevant.[207]

Moore also suggests a number of interventions for the resolution of various types of conflicts.

The literature researched in the area of conflict resolution

provides a philosophical view of conflicts which often hamper the work of organizations, a variety of views on the resolution of such conflicts and a framework for analyzing organizational conflicts and the way in which they can be resolved.

# CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

A case study methodology has been employed to investigate the problem of building a consensus for national history standards. A case study, according to Robert K. Yin "epitomizes a research method for attempting valid inferences from events outside the laboratory while at the same time retaining the goals of knowledge shared with laboratory science."[208] The case-type methodology used in this research is the preferred strategy when 'how' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus of the study is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context.[209] The National History Standards Project met all the requirements for a case-type study, and it focused on answering the "how" questions related to the National History Standards Project.

Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall say that "a case study requires the collection of very extensive data in order to produce an in-depth understanding of the entity being studied."[210] Yin says that the overriding principles important in the collection of data in case studies include the use of:

> ...multiple sources of evidence...converging on the same facts or findings; (2) a case study data base - a formal assembly of evidence distinct from the final case study report, and (3) a chain of evidence - that is, explicit links between the questions asked, the data collected, and the conclusions drawn.[211]

Principles of Data Collection

In this case study, the researcher followed Yin's overriding principles for the collection of data by using[212]:

A. Multiple sources of evidence converging on the same facts or findings. Such evidence included:

*Correspondence between members of the National History Standards Project and the co-Directors illustrating areas of controversy and evidence of resolution or attempted resolution of such controversies.

*Multiple versions of standards dealing with controversial issues which illustrate the evolution of change due to the consensus-building dynamics.

*Participants' views of the way in which consensus was built concerning controversial issues.

B. A case study data base, that is a formal assembly of evidence distinct from the final case study report. The data base included:

*Materials such as agendas, rosters, correspondence, topics for consideration from every meeting of the National Council for History Standards.

*All progress reports issued by the National History Standards Project.

*The testimonies of the representatives of the National Forum for History Standards.

*The codified data from telephone interviews of the purposeful group.

C. A chain of evidence which explicitly linked the questions asked, the data collected and the conclusions drawn. This chain of evidence provided:

*An answer to the following research questions:

A. What was the organizational structure of the

National History Standards Project?

B. Who was involved in the process of setting national standards for history?

C. What was the timetable by which the National History Standards Project anticipated completion of its task and how it was met?

D. What were the controversial issues addressed by the National History Standards Project?

E. How was consensus built?

F. Which issues remain problematic?

G. How might the consensus building process of the National History Standards Project be applied to similar situations?

*A confirmation of the ideas expressed in the seven propositions which shaped the collection of data and helped to organize the study.[213]

Type of Data

The case study methodology depended heavily on primary sources such as letters of correspondence, testimonies of participants, participant rosters, agendas of meetings, and grant proposals. Other sources included direct response data from telephone interviews administered by the researcher and accounts of participant-observers. Also included were a number of progress reports of the National History Standards Project and reports of various focus groups. Evidence was also gleaned from such secondary sources of information as journal articles, newspaper commentaries, and other reports in the mass media as well as from books and articles in journals and periodicals.

Data Collection Process

For this case study, data collection included documentary information, archival records, interviews, and participant observations.[214]

1. Documentary Information

The researcher collected letters, memoranda, agendas of meetings and written reports of participants. In addition, administration documents such as proposals and progress reports, as well as internal documents were collected. To complement this collection, a host of news clippings and other mass media articles were gathered.

2. Archival Records

The archival records collected for this study include organizational charts, lists of names, survey data, and such personal data as telephone listings.

3. Telephone Interviews of a Purposeful Sample of Key Groups

In order to corroborate the evidence collected from the primary data and supported by the secondary data, a focused telephone interview of a purposeful sample of key groups involved in the National History Standards Project was conducted. To assure the integrity of the interview process, pre-interview letters (Appendix B) were sent to all members of the purposeful group, informing them of the purpose of the telephone interview and instructing them regarding the follow-up questionnaire. Several of the interviews were conducted in person since the

researcher had access to the respondents during a two-day meeting of the members of the National Council for History Standards. The interview questions (Appendix C) were carefully constructed to encourage respondents to provide a fresh commentary and thus enable the interviewer to corroborate certain facts which have been established according to the interviewer.[215] The interviews were not tape recorded. This decision was a personal preference of the researcher based on the experienced advice of senior researchers. According to Professor Wolfgang Pindur, taped interviews cause interviewees to adjust their responses because of the influence of the tape recorder.[216] Dwight Allen also says that while documenting interview findings is important, the interviews themselves are better when not taped because untaped interviews ensure more candid response.[217] To ensure accuracy and provide a method of codifying information, the researcher faxed a one page questionnaire to each interviewee at the end of the interview which the interviewee faxed back to the researcher (Appendix D). This strategy provided external validation of the content of the interview.

The interview was focused to provide answers to such questions as:

1. What was the nature of your involvement in the National History Standards Project?
2. What is the level of your satisfaction with the process used for standards building for history by the National History Standards Project?
3. What were the controversial issues which had to be resolved by the National History Standards Project through a consensus building process?

4. How was consensus built?

5. Are there any issues which remain unresolved?

6. To improve the process what would you change?

In order that the data collection be reliable, elements of the recursive interview were also incorporated in the telephone interview. The faxed questionnaire gleaned information of essential value and thus enabled the researcher to make important additions to the data base of this study. The purposeful group interviews included representatives of every group and/or organization involved in the National History Standards Project, a total of forty people.

a. National Council for History Standards members (18)

b. Organizational focus groups (12 members)

c. Curriculum Task Forces (10 active members)

d. Representatives among participants in the National Forum for History Standards (2)

e. Funding agencies (2 representatives)

f. The Assistant Director of the National History Standards Project (1) (Appendix E)

4. Participant Observations

One of the strengths of this research is that the researcher has been a participant observations in the development of national standards for history. Robert K. Yin writes that "...participant-observer provides certain unusual opportunities for collecting case study data...the most distinctive opportunity is related to the investigator's ability to gain access to events or groups that are otherwise inaccessible to scientific

investigations..."[218] As a participant-observer, this researcher not only has had access to unlimited information but also has had the rare opportunity to understand intimately the feeling and spirit of the entire process, thus "perceiving reality from the viewpoint of someone 'inside' the case study rather than external to it."[219]

A participant-observer, however, may be perceived as biased. R. K. Yin also discusses problems related to participant observation, suggesting the difficulty of the investigator working as an external observer, falling into the group-think posture, or the excessive demand of time required for participation which makes observation difficult.[220] In the first chapter, the researcher elaborated on the issue of researcher's biases.

While the researcher is a participant-observer, this study's protocol indicates that a combination of techniques have been employed to ensure the reliability of data collection and to subject the data to triangulation. The tradeoffs between the tremendous opportunities of participant-observation and the problems which may result have been seriously considered by the researcher who has concluded that this research, which is dependent for data on several sources, is stronger for the invaluable perspectives gained by participant-observation.

Method of Data Analysis

Robert K. Yin says that "data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating or otherwise recombining the evidence, to address the initial propositions of a study."[221] In order to accomplish these tasks, Yin suggests the use of analytic techniques such as putting information in chronological order, tabulating the frequency of different events, and putting information into different arrays.[222] Yin further suggests that the ultimate goal in any research is "to treat the evidence fairly, to produce compelling analytic conclusions, and to rule out alternative interpretations."[223] To accomplish such goal, the researcher analyzed the data "relying on the theoretical propositions of the study."[224] Yin describes the general strategy of relying on theoretical propositions as one of the two preferred methods of general analyses of case type studies. Since the original objectives and design of the case study were based on a set of propositions, those propositions "reflected a set of research questions, reviews of literature and new insights."[225] Yin also states that when one relies on the propositions of the study to analyze the data, one can pay attention to certain data and ignore other data.[226]

Based on the propositions of this study, analysis was conducted involving the following:

1. The structure of the organization and how inclusionary it was in its operation.
2. The timetable of the project and how reasonable it was

in ensuring the completion of the organization's task.

3. The membership of the standard-setting organization and how representative it was of the various groups interested in the development of national standards for history.

4. Identification of the controversial issues which required resolution and illustration of the process of resolution of those issues.

5. Explanation of the consensus-building process including specific examples showing the consensus-building process interventions as they were followed by the National History Standards Project.

6. Identification of issues which remain less than satisfactorily resolved.

7. Recommendations on the basis of the data analysis, regarding the implementation of the national standards for history and recommendations for further research.

# CHAPTER IV

# BUILDING CONSENSUS

This study to determine how broad consensus was built for the development of national standards for history relies on seven propositions which shape its organization, the collection of data, and reflect a set of research questions.[227] The seven propositions arrange the data into seven arrays conducive to systematic analysis.

Data examined from primary sources such as progress reports, testimonies, letters, agendas, and verbatim records, was analyzed vis-a-vis the propositions. Telephone interviews were conducted with a purposeful group of key participants in the National History Standards Project to corroborate the evidence gleaned from the primary data. Evidence collected from the telephone interviews was codified by having each interviewee fill out and return a questionnaire immediately following each telephone interview.

## ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Proposition one, that effective organizations have a well defined organizational structure, relates to the first research question which asked what was the organizational structure of the National History Standards Project. Answering this question illuminates the nature of the organization by indicating whether

the organization was structured in a way that fostered cooperation among its member groups, or whether it was structured hierarchically. Further, the first research question was concerned with whether the structure of the organization was open and fair to allow the possibility of reaching a broad consensus on the contentious issues related to history standards.

The application which Charlotte Crabtree submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities on November 5, 1991, proposed an organizational structure composed of ten groups. This proposed organizational model, featured a National Committee for K-12 History Standards, or U.S. History Standards Task Force and six Resource Groups. (Appendix C) The National Coordinating Council for K-12 History Standards with a membership of 15 included representatives from several organizations:

*The National Center for History in the Schools which was the convening agency and chair of the Coordinating Council

*The National Council for History Education

*The Organization of History Teachers

*The American Historical Association

*The Organization of American Historians

*The World History Association

*The History Teaching Alliance

*Elementary Teachers of the Classics

*The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

*The National Council for the Social Studies

*The Council of Chief State School Officers.[228] (Appendix F)

In her application, Crabtree explained that the National

Coordinating Council would also include:

> ...3 or more individuals with special expertise in leadership in education at the K-12 levels who will contribute to the Council's ethnic and geographic diversity as well as sensitivity to the issues and needs of urban inner-city and minority students.[229]

The function of the National Coordinating Council for K-12 History Standards was "to reach consensus on the purposes, basic principles, organizational structure, and work plans for this national consensus-building project."[230] In addition, the National Coordinating Council for K-12 History Standards was expected to establish a National Committee for K-12 History Standards with "up to 35 members, broadly drawn to ensure geographic and ethnic diversity."[231] This committee was to include:

> ...professional historians...precollegiate history teachers; curriculum leaders, supervisors, school administrators, and chief state school officers; members of the National School Boards Association and of the National PTA; historical archivists, museum directors, and/or directors of historic sites and heritage projects; legislators holding appointments on education committees of State Senates and Houses of Representatives or Assemblies; and representation from the Education Commission of the States.[232]

In addition, the National Coordinating Council in K-12 History Standards was expected to form four to six National Resource Groups representing:

> ...such organizations as: the National Council for History Education; the National Council for the Social Studies; the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians;...[233]

To be convened by March 1992, were two curriculum task forces, one in United States history and one in world history.[234]

In the first two months of preparatory work, the directors of the National History Standards Project replaced this organizational structure with a model Crabtree said was the result of an effort "to find the most effective means of integrating the participation of the many groups who must be incorporated into this process."[235]

To the original ten groups, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) organization was added and the resource groups more precisely defined. The most striking change was the addition of the National Forum for History Standards which shared center stage with the National Council for History Standards.[236]

The new organizational structure of the National History Standards Project designated the following groups:

1. A National Council for History Standards of approximately 25 members.
2. Eight Organizational Focus Groups.
3. Two Curriculum Task Forces of approximately 15 members each.
4. A National Forum for History Standards of about 25 members.[237] (Appendix D)

The July 1993, Progress Report of the National History Standards Project shows that the organizational model remained essentially the same, except the number of members in each group increased from that originally anticipated in February 1992. In addition, an ad-hoc world history committee was created to establish criteria for world history standards. The National History Standards Project grew to a total of one hundred and ninety members, representing every affiliated professional

organization and a wide array of organizations representing America's cultural, gender, racial, and ethnic diversity.[238] As reported in the several Progress Reports issued by the National History Standards Project, [239] the function of each of the groups remained largely unchanged throughout the task.

From the beginning, Crabtree had emphasized the importance of consensus-building. In her 26 page proposal, the word consensus appeared 25 times.[240]

The organizational structure of the National History Standards Project was designed for consensus-building. The function of each of the groups required the collaboration of all others for any to accomplish its task. The National Council for History Standards was designed as a "policy-setting body responsible for providing policy direction and oversight of the Project."[241]

The National Forum for History Standards was advisory in its function and provided the project, "important counsel and feedback...as well as access to the larger public through the membership of the organizations represented in the Forum."[242]

The Curriculum Task Forces, whose rosters featured scholars and teachers from across America, were expected to develop the standards, convert the content standards to grade-appropriate performance standards, and develop illustrative teaching activities.[243]

The eight Organizational Focus Groups whose function was "to provide important advisory, review and consulting services to the

Project"[244] were diverse in their missions. While they were independent from each other, they nevertheless interacted professionally and reached larger audiences of professionals.

Following the model used by governors Campbell and Romer in the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Crabtree and Nash, accepted counsel and advice from the Organizational Focus groups but did not allow the Focus groups to participate in the main deliberations of the National Council for History Standards. This rule prompted one of the Focus groups, the American Historical Association, to characterize the arrangement as a gag rule and to officially complain about it.[245]

The success of the project depended heavily on the success of the organizational structure and the skills of the co-directors of the Project. Crabtree and Nash had to create the organizational ethos necessary for the unprecedented kind of work required of all groups if a consensus for dealing with the controversial issues were to be built.

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL HISTORY STANDARDS PROJECT

The degree to which the all-inclusive structure of the Project would be successful also depended on the commitment of the diverse groups to work harmoniously under the umbrella of the National History Standards Project to develop national standards for history. These diverse groups and their interest in the outcome of the process for developing national standards for history were the subject of the second proposition of this study.

It is in the interest of any organization charged with the responsibility of overseeing a standards-setting process to include representatives of the organizations who have a stake in the outcome of the process.

A careful look at the membership of the Project must focus first on the co-directors of the Project, Crabtree and Nash, and on their assistant director, Linda Symcox. Crabtree and Nash came to the Project with established professional credentials and a reputation for success in building a broad consensus among people working in other projects.

Crabtree, whose "genius for consensus building"[246] was praised by Diane Ravitch, is a professor in the Graduate School of Education at UCLA. She served as an advisor to the National Endowment for the Humanities in its 1987 study of the state of humanities in the schools. In 1987, she worked as a principal co-writer of the new California History-Social Science Framework. In 1987-1988, she served as a member of the Bradley Commission on History in the Schools.[247] Crabtree is the director of the UCLA/NEH National Center for History in the Schools, and was one of the editors of Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire. She was appointed to the History Task Force of the National Council for Standards and Testing,[248] and serves on the Planning Committee of the NAEP Consensus Project for the 1994 assessment of United States History.[249] Crabtree has been involved intimately for many years, and especially since 1987, in major national efforts

to bring attention to the teaching of history in the nation's schools and to develop standards to upgrade the present status of history education.

Gary Nash, the other co-director of the National History Standards Project, is a professor of history and associate director of the National Center for History in the Schools. He was an editor, along with Crabtree and others, of Lessons from History. Nash is a trustee of The National Council for History Education, a member of the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and president-elect of that organization.

Linda Symcox, the assistant director of the National History Standards Project, is also the Assistant Director of the National Center for History in the schools UCLA/NEH and the Project Developer and Series Editor of the Center's teaching publications.

Crabtree, Nash and Symcox assembled a group of 200 participants who served in various capacities in the Project to develop national standards for history. While a full listing of project participants and contributors can be found in Appendix H, it is important to note that in addition to this researcher, the group included college professors, pre-collegiate teachers, state superintendents of education, curriculum specialists, textbook industry representatives, and representatives of 31 organizations whose membership covers a large spectrum of America's public and private educational community. Project participants come from all 50 states and the District of Columbia and included members of

diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

TIMETABLE OF THE NATIONAL HISTORY STANDARDS PROJECT

The subject of history is fraught with contentious issues, and the timetable for the completion of the task required working with deliberate speed. This proposition led to the third question of the study, what was the timetable by which the National History Standards Project anticipated completion of its task?

In her application, Crabtree noted that there were three major phases of the standards-writing project: The initial start-up activities from December 1991 to May 1992, the development of standards from June 1992 to September 1993, and the acceptance and dissemination of the standards from October 1993 to June 1994.[250] Addressing the issue of time Crabtree said, "We believe this schedule is realistic and can be met."[251] Her optimism regarding the timetable was related to her anticipation that "the work of the standards-setting project will be built upon the History Center's 300-page volume, Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire, a major resource to which three years of work has already been devoted."[252]

Crabtree also counted as an available resource "the NAEP consensus project establishing the Framework for the 1994 National Assessment in United States History" which, she wrote, "will be nearing completion in May 1992."[253] Considering the possibility that it might prove impossible to reach consensus on

history standards by November 1993, she expected that "the remaining months of winter and spring 1994 would...be devoted to further work to bring all parties into consensus before June 1994."[254]

With the timetable for the completion of the task of the National History Standards Project set, what happened follows. On December 16, 1991, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the U.S. Department of Education jointly announced the funding of the National History Standards Project. In January of 1992, appointments were made to the National Council for History Standards, "the policy-setting board with oversight responsibilities for the National History Standards Project, developing national achievement standards in history for the nation's schools, elementary through secondary."[255] On February 21, 1992, the first meeting of the National Council for History Standards took place in Washington D.C. In this meeting, the tone of the Council's mission was set, and the relationships between the Council and the other groups under the Project's umbrella were established. Recommendations were also made for membership in the Curriculum Task Forces. In addition, the Council heard several reports providing the background for the standards-setting process. On April 1992, the National Forum met jointly in Washington D.C. with the National Council for History Standards. At that meeting, the representatives of the various organizations constituting the National Forum presented their views concerning the teaching of history in the nation's schools.

Subsequent meetings of the National Council for History Standards took place in May 1992, and June 1992, in Washington D.C.

In July 1992, the Curriculum Task Forces met at UCLA to write history standards. In September, the National Council for History Standards met in Washington and reviewed the work of the Task Forces. At that time, the National Council for History Standards created an ad hoc committee for world history under the leadership of Professor Michael Winston. The purpose of the ad-hoc committee was:

> ...to advise the Council on the proper focus, balance, and scope of world history for the schools, and to prepare a set of Organizing Questions to guide the further development of standards for world history.[256]

The Curriculum Task Force in world history met four times from November 1992 to May 1993 to develop standards for world history.

In June of 1993, the National Council for History Standards met in Washington and approved the recommendations of the world history committee. In the meantime, the Curriculum Task Force in U.S. history completed its work, and drafts of the U.S. history standards were sent for review by the Eight Organizational Focus Groups and the members of the National Forum.

In the October 1993, Progress Report and Sample Standards, the directors of the National History Standards Project indicated that over the next twelve months standards would be developed and reviewed, public hearings would be held to build a broad national consensus, and revisions would be made under the direction of the National Council for History Standards.[257]

Crabtree had anticipated that it would take two to two and

one-half years to complete the project. She had underestimated the need for time. The project took longer than anticipated. Adhering as closely as possible to the projected timetable, yet allowing for flexibility, circumstances developed which required additional time and attention. The timetable of the National History Standards Project was reasonable, but the task of writing history standards was colossal. As a result of time constraints, some participants felt that there was no time allocated in the agendas of the National Council for History Standards to debate nagging issues. Another time concern was related to the writing of the world history standards, which was a much more complicated process than writing U.S. history standards. In a telephone interview with this researcher, John Pyne, a member of the Curriculum Task Force in world history, identified some of the difficulties involved in writing national standards for world history. World history, Pyne said, has not been formulated and organized the way U.S. history has. Generally, historians have not agreed upon such questions as the periodization of world history. Debates about how to organize world history are on-going inside the profession.[258]

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

From the onset, controversial and disparate issues were expected to emerge in the development of national history standards; thus, the fourth proposition of this study is that a number of controversial issues will inevitably exist in any

effort to set standards for the teaching of history. The major controversies in this task were expected to be related to the issues of content and process, multiculturalism, and the position of western civilization in the world history curriculum. Proposition four led to the next question to be answered in this study, what were the controversial issues addressed by the National History Standards Project?

The debates of the last ten years surrounding the state of history in our schools have made it abundantly clear that any effort to develop standards for history would come face to face with several contentious issues. One of these is the issue of process and content.

The content and process issue stems from philosophical and pedagogical differences of opinion as well as from mistrust and misperceptions among professionals. The content group advocates that students learn a body of knowledge in each subject matter which is deemed necessary and appropriate for each level of education by the scholars and professionals in each field. The process group seems to be divided into two camps. One camp argues that content without attention to process is not pedagogically sound and offers suggestions regarding integrating curricula, allowing for depth, encouraging critical thinking and making thematic connections. The other camp regards content with suspicion. This group equates content with an array of mindless facts, terms, and dates and assumes that thinking does not take place when the emphasis is on content. Additionally, both groups

are suspicious of each other's intentions. Process advocates are often viewed with suspicion by some historians and members of the education profession as being determined to derail the national history standards effort. Nevertheless, the content versus process debate, did not present as much of a problem as was anticipated. It became apparent as the work began that the members of the National History Standards Project, teachers, historians, administrators, and curriculum specialists had no interest in developing standards that are merely an accumulation of facts. They intended to create not only rich content standards, but also rich process standards.

The issue of content and process is of critical importance in the teaching of all subjects and the National History Standards Project accomplished a model for conciliating. A host of players must be credited for this accomplishment. First, the historians who directed the work of the standards writing process were willing to listen to the pre-collegiate teachers who worked with them. Teachers' testimonies point to the collegiality with which the project was carried out. Joan Arno, speaking of the work of the pre-collegiate teachers and the scholars indicated both her appreciation for the availability of the scholars to provide advice and direction as well as her satisfaction with the scholars' interest in what the teachers had to say regarding process and the nature of the learners. She said, "It has been a wonderful open process, we were listened to."[259]

Sara Shoob, an administrator who worked on the writing of

K-4 standards as a member of the Curriculum Task Force in U.S. and world history compared the kind of work the group did in the summer of 1992 to the work done in the summer of 1993. Shoob said that the first summer, the teachers wrote what the historians recommended. In the second summer, however, the teachers totally reorganized the work to create standards they believed were more appropriate for the students. "We had input on what we thought the standards should be," Shoob said. "The historians really listened to our suggestions."[260]

The issue of content and process was also defused by the work of the Organizational Focus Groups, which kept the balance between content and process constantly in the forefront of deliberations. This work contributed to the successful conciliation of content, which historians considered essential, and process, which educators did not wish to ignore.

On April 24 and 25, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development wrote in its "Recommendations to the National History Standards Project":

> While we acknowledge the importance of a content base in the study of history, content alone is not enough to prepare students for work, citizenship, and productive lives. The development of history standards must go beyond the basis of content (what students should know) and include standards by which to measure specific student attitudes and values (what students should be like) and intellectual skills (what students should be able to do).[261]

The National Council for Social Studies in its Organizational Focus report addressed the issue of student, content and context. Since the National Council for Social

Studies (NCSS) has a reputation as an organization which is more concerned with process and less with content standards, this researcher carefully examined all the formal reports and official correspondence between the National Council for Social Studies Organizational Focus Group and the National History Standards Project and found no remarkable evidence to substantiate such charges.

In its undated report to the National History Standards Project, the National Council for Social Studies Focus Group expressed the organization's views:

> Learning takes place as child and content come together in a particular context. It is therefore not enough for standards to be established only for history content; the learner and the context must also be taken into account.[262]

The National Council for Social Studies did not, however, endorse history as the center of the social studies, as other organizations had done. While participating in the National History Standards Project, the NCSS proceeded independently to develop standards for the Social Studies.

The American Historical Association in its report of the world history Focus Group also offered its membership's view on content versus process:

> Standards for world history should be less didactic, focus less on content coverage, and provide greater flexibility for teachers and more opportunities for students to explore history as process rather than product.[263]

While the degree to which each Focus Group was willing to endorse the development of high and rigorous standards differed,

no organization participating in the National History Standards Project opposed the development of standards in the official reports of their respective groups.

In his July 14, 1992, letter to Crabtree, James B. Gardner, Deputy Executive Director of the American Historical Association, wrote: "Basically, we think the project is on the right track. Overall, the material looks balanced, and we think that the AHA's focus groups will support the end product if it follows this line..."[264] While Gardner listed several objections of the American Historical Association in regard to other specific issues, he did not raise any serious objections regarding content and process.

Many participants in the process of writing standards for history agreed that once they became involved in the project, even if they had doubts about the reconciliation of content and process, they saw no reason to even consider it an issue.

Susan Meisler, a teacher member of the Curriculum Task Force on World History, is comfortable with the resolution of the content and process issue. As a member of the Connecticut Council for Social Studies, Meisler was aware of the position of the National Council on Social Studies (NCSS) in favor of process. From the onset, the NCSS had viewed the standards movement with suspicion. Meisler indicated that the Curriculum Task Force on world history attempted to deal with the criticism of the NCSS in regard to content versus process. According to Meisler, as the work of the Curriculum Task Force progressed and

versions of the standards were sent to the NCSS for review, the members of the Task Force began to recognize a shift of attitude from the NCSS.[265]

Earl Bell, a teacher and member of the National Council for History Standards, saw the argument of process and content as an effort by some groups to maintain the status quo in the teaching of social studies by destroying the chronological order as an organizing method and by advocating multiple approaches to scope and sequence.[266] John Pyne saw the content and process argument as an inevitable issue in the writing of history standards as it has been a major, on-going debate within the profession for some time.[267] "Achieving consensus for the project from many social studies educators hostile to content of any kind," said Pyne, was a problem and:

> ...it will remain to be seen whether they continue to work at watering down content in favor of 'process' standards, which allow social studies teachers to pretty much do as they have always done.[268]

Pyne praised the work of the Organizational Focus Groups for their critiques of the standards. "I found some of the suggestions they made very valuable," said Pyne. "Some of their suggestions were right on the money."[269]

Reflecting on the issue of content and process and other controversies which faced the teachers writing standards, David Vigilante, a participant in the writing of U.S. history standards and a teacher, had this to say:

> Although we confronted each of these issue in the development of the Standards, we shared the same vision and did not need to resolve issues among ourselves. As

> teachers, we have witnessed how our field has become impotent as a result of the poor teaching with no real direction. The issue of content versus process is a false dichotomy; content and process are not mutually exclusive and can not be separated.[270]

Participants also credit the leadership of the co-directors of the Project, Crabtree and Nash, for the diffusion of the issue of content and process. By allowing a large number of voices to be heard in an open and fair process, Crabtree and Nash opened all views for scrutiny, thus helping to correct misperceptions and exposing unreasonable views.

The fourth and perhaps the most important force that prevented the issue of content and process from impeding the standards writing process, were the standards themselves. Once the standards were drafted and sent out for wide review, concerns regarding process waned. The standards spoke for themselves.

Besides the process and content controversy, there were other issues which required resolution. In her proposal, Crabtree had identified sources of controversy which she said would be related to the "importance to be placed on ethnic diversity, identity, and plurality in our national history and on the binding values, ideals, and democratic institutions that unify the nation and whose origins lie in the history of western civilization."[271]

Crabtree and others recognized that two specifically contentious issues would be the place of western civilization in the teaching of world history and the place of ethnic diversity and multiculturalism in the teaching of U.S. history. As the two

issues are inextricably linked, they naturally came to the forefront of the debate together.

One of the earliest indications that multiculturalism including the history of minorities in the development of national standards for history would be a contested issue came about on April 9-10, 1992, at the joint meeting of the National Council for History Standards and the National Forum. At the same time, the issue of the place of western civilization in world history standards emerged. At that time, the National Forum members gave testimonies of their organizational positions and submitted position papers. According to the Educational Excellence Network:

> The first area where we see the need for balance is in the debate between the 'pluribus' and the 'unum' as Arthur Schlesinger and Diane Ravitch, among others, have termed it. We must teach about diversity, to be sure, but must never lose sight of that which binds us together as a nation. As Schlesinger says in The Disuniting of America, 'our task is to combine due appreciation of the splendid diversity of the nation with due emphasis on the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy, and human rights. These are the ideas that define the American nationality - and that today empower people of all continents, races, and creeds.[272]

The Educational Excellence Network advocated centering the standards of history on the ideas of Democracy:

> It is of prime importance to us that the democratic idea receives the attention and prominence it deserves in the education of our children...We believe that the full story of democracy, neither disguising nor apologizing for its innate superiority to other forms of government, should be the centerpiece of our teaching of history.[273]

Striking a note of warning, the report of the Educational Excellence Network went on to say:

> There exists today a very dangerous form of pedagogy: one that treats all assertions, however absurd, as equally valid; all information, however spurious, as equally trustworthy; all doctrines, however illogical, as equally worthy of attention; all systems of government, however they have fared historically, as equally valid and praiseworthy. This relativism denies students the moral and intellectual basis on which to evaluate information and ideas and threatens to erode support for our democratic system of government...[274]

Ivan B. Gluckman, a representative of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, speaking of inclusiveness in history, said:

> ...I would just...urge all of you...to consider that if it's wrong to explore only the mainstream of the majority, it may also not be feasible to try to explore every spring and rivulet of history in which each racial, ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural group may have had a part. If the country is to survive as a nation, it has to continue to be an inclusionary society, not perhaps a melting pot as once conceived, but not a collection of isolated groups either...[275]

The representative of the League of United Latin American Citizens, Cesar Collantes, spoke about the place of Hispanics in American History:

> There has been a lot of history written in which Hispanics have not been portrayed, despite their many contributions from the beginning. There's more to Hispanics' presence in America than just the Southwest, or the War With Mexico, or the Battle of the Alamo...There were Hispanics who fought in the Revolutionary War and there was an (sic) Hispanic medal of honor winner in the Civil War. There have been many Hispanic contributions throughout the fifties and the sixties, including the civil rights movement.[276]

Representing the Quality Education for Minorities Network, Mary Futrell said:

> When we talk about inclusivity, I believe that the new standards, the new curriculum we are developing, should reflect the culture, the gender, the religious, the political, the economic, and the social contributions which have been made to this country by a wide variety of

> groups. And we need to make sure that we do not, as we have in the past, slight certain groups or in some instances, totally leave them out of the picture. I think that it is time for us to tell the truth, I think that it is time for all students to learn about the many contributions which have been made to this country by many groups, not simply Afro-Americans or women, but all groups. I think that we need to recognize that with the exception of the American Indians, we are all immigrants. And so the question we have before us, is how do we honor diversity, and yet stay unified. I am of the school that believes we can accomplish that goal. I think that we can reflect the diversity of our country and be much more unified than we've ever been before. I think that it would be a strength and not a weakness for us.[277]

Ruth Granados, representative of the Council of the Great City Schools, spoke of "a culturally based curriculum" as well as the significance of the European heritage of this country.

> I know from my background, that most of my peers coming from the Southwest were not interested in, nor did they not (sic) understand what European history had to do with them or their future. But I understood that I have freedom, and that's how European history relates with my future...[278]

Ruth Wattenberg, representing the American Federation of Teachers, spoke about multiculturalism in the classroom when she said that multicultural education at its best:

> ...helps to bring together our <u>pluribus</u> and our <u>unum</u>. After all, America was a multicultural nation at its founding. Our culture and especially our politics--from the religious freedom clauses in the First Amendment to anti slavery laws, the Voting Rights Act, and immigration policy--have been shaped by both the presence and the activism of America's many minorities...[279]

Wattenberg also said that multicultural education at its worst is alarming because of "its call to separatism and its reliance on dubious scholarship."[280]

The tone and the emphasis of the members of the forum varied. What was clearly evident, however, was the consistent

call for U.S. history to be inclusive. According to the representative from the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, Cynthia Neverdon-Morton, the Afro-American experience must be placed:

> ...on the center stage of major events and movements in U.S. history. We know that that history, cannot begin in the United States. It is necessary to introduce students to the African past. In doing so, we must look at the scholarship, the writing of such people as Chaka Tusur, John Henry Clark, Chancellor Williams, Carter G. Woodson. We have not heard those names mentioned.[281]

Penn Kemble, representing the Education for Democracy Project, spoke about the need to teach about democracy and the democratic ideals. "Democracy", he said, "is a way of life that requires a people to become citizens and to exhibit what Tocqueville called the habits of the heart that direct and sustain free institutions."[282]

For some, inclusiveness was measured by the way in which U.S. history treated the story of their own ethnic group, including its historic hatreds. The representative of the National Association of Asian and Pacific American Education, Nguyen Minh Chau, offered a criticism of Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire. She said:

> ...There is no inclusiveness, there's an absence of pertinent information, regarding for example, the historical background of the Cambodians and the Vietnamese, their past historical relationships, and the animosities that existed in this region that would make it difficult for them to come to this country and work as a cohesive group...[283]

Chau also spoke about the need to teach children in this

country that: "Catholicism was one of the tools of the French Government at that time to make Indochina a colony. And this should be taught...especially to the Indochinese children."[284]

Sara R. Shoob wrote of teaching history to meet the needs of a pluralistic society:

> While we must teach the history and values of western civilization, we must also teach children about the history and cultures of other nations and about the contributions that a wide variety of people have made to our culture. Achieving some kind of balance in this area is an incredible task...With an inclusive multi-cultural component, children gain a greater self-awareness and self-esteem as well as a greater understanding and tolerance of others.[285]

Mabel Lake Murray, the representative of the National Alliance of Black School Educators voiced the need to tell her version of "the truth":

> Because we see American history as African American history, we believe that there should be an infusion, and I don't necessarily see that kind of infusion in here, the kind that we might be looking for. If we're going to look at the economic/technology area, we need to look at the Baseline Essays which were developed by Asa Hilliard, and implemented in Portland, Oregon. We need to look at them from the point of view that Africans originated a certain economic base that has been bastardized and revitalized throughout the history of the world. We need to include as well that mathematics started as a science in one of the African nations.[286]

Clifford E. Trafzer from the Native American Heritage Commission testified on behalf of his organization and submitted a paper outlining his group's position about history standards. He wrote:

> Rather than deal with American history from a European perspective, historical study must include an understanding of American history from an American point of view. That is to say that rather than simply looking at 'The Age of Discovery' and the 'Columbian Discovery'

> as positive, uplifting, honorable events conducted by men of vision and strength, it must consider the American view of the invasion, conquest, and subjugation of Native Americans through Indian policies of slavery and war, and land policies designed to extinguish the Native American estate...Representative interpretations by Native Americans must be offered to students, and these views must be included in any national standards.[287]

Telling the ancient Snohomish Indian story of the Mouse and the Wolf, Trafzer reminded the National Council for History Standards that "...in creating national standards for the teaching of history in the schools, we must be generous and giving..."[288]

In what seemed to this participant-observer like an intellectual and emotional roller-coaster, speaker after speaker took the audience in different directions. A. Graham Down, President of the Council for Basic Education, asked his audience to "consider the virtues of a more patently interdisciplinary approach to the teaching of history."[289] Graham saw history as:

> ...more than an attempt to familiarize students with the past, important as this is: Rather the study of History is ideally suited to fostering responsible citizenship, to developing the ability to sustain and support an argument in a piece of expository prose, and above all to provoke the intellectual curiosity of the life-long learner.[290]

Charles F. Bahmueller, writing for the Center for Civic Education listed several suggestions for the development of national standards for U.S. history:

1. High standards of accuracy and absence of distortion
2. Inclusion of political history
3. Fostering of common civic identity
4. Chronological history

5. Inclusion of the history of ideas; clear definition of political concepts

6. Comparative studies

7. History 'warts and all'

8. The idea of 'unhistorical' arguments and perspectives[291]

Explaining the idea of "unhistorical" arguments and perspectives, Bahmueller offered this warning:

> ...we think that the student of history should be instructed in what constitutes 'unhistorical' thinking. They should know that it is illegitimate-'unhistorical'-to incorporate today's concerns, moral and ethical ideas, and other perspectives into a past where they do not belong. How to judge the past is surely in some cases a difficult undertaking; and some of the notorious pitfalls of historical judgement should be taught plainly, using examples. Among these, beside historical thinking, are blanket verdicts in which skeptical intrusions, nuance, divided opinion, grounds for ambivalence, paucity and ambiguity of evidence, and the like fail to inform historical judgement. Exceptions excepted, Manichean views are exercises in shallow thinking.[292]

In that joint meeting of the National Forum and the National Council for History Standards, it was apparent to this participant-observer that people and organizations were coming into the standards-writing project with various degrees of information about the project, mixed understandings about standards, various agendas, a lack of common language, and various degrees of trust. One thing was certain, however. The question of the inclusion of minorities in the teaching of history was a common thread. What was troublesome about inclusiveness was the tone in which the issue was advocated by some and the degree to which some insisted their version of history should be taught in the schools. Equally significant was

the emphasis on teaching history as a way to preserve the balance between diversity and unity as a nation.

In addition to presentations by the members of the National Forum, abundant evidence was piling up to establish the questions of inclusiveness in U.S. history and the place of western civilization in world history as controversial issues in the development of history standards. The Organizational Focus Groups were asked to review Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire and apprise the Project's directors and the National Council for History Standards about its utility as a resource for the standards-writing groups. Clearly, inclusiveness and the place of western civilization surfaced again.

Josef W. Konvitz of the National Council for History Education Focus Group said about inclusiveness:

> Questions were raised whether inclusiveness runs the risk of being politicized by some groups, but on the balance the focus group believes that inclusiveness is justified by the humanistic value of history itself. There is a tension between attending to social and cultural diversity in American history, and emphasizing cohesive tendencies in political and economic affairs. The need for both approaches and perspectives must be convincing and clear throughout the text.[293]

In a letter to Elaine W. Reed, J. Jeffrey Welsh reviewed Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire, commenting on the importance of settling the tension between multiculturalists and traditional historians:

> I sensed a philosophical tension in the narrative (especially chapters one and two) between what I call

> the Neo-Platonists (e.g., Strauss, Bloom) and the Neo-Aristotelians (i.e., multiculturalists). I think this tension needs to be addressed. After all, how a learning outcome ultimately is defined will in large part be influenced by which perspective dominates.[294]

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development recommended that "national history standards must stress multiculturalism and issues of diversity, including inequalities arising from social class and gender."[295]

The Organization of American Historians Focus Group Report also endorsed "... an inclusive approach to political history as the core of secondary school history instruction."[296] The American Historical Association's Report objected to the interpretation of the Bradley Commission's Report as it was presented in Lessons From History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Know saying they were troubled by this statement in Lessons:

> Hence the declaration of the Bradley Commission on History that democratic citizens must grasp three sorts of historic reality: the American past, **to tell us who we are, what we have done, and what we are becoming;** the Western, or European past, **to understand our moral and political heritage and the causes of its advances and its failures;** and the history of non-European civilizations, **to know the nations and peoples with whom we shall live out a common destiny.** (p. 13, para. 3)

The AHA said,

> Underlying the author's interpretation of Bradley is a clear presumption that students are of European descent. We note, for instance, that 'our' refers solely to West Europeans, and that 'non-Europeans' are cast as essentially alien peoples with whom we have to get along. That passage should be revised to read:
>
> > Hence the declaration of the Bradley Commission on History that democratic citizens must grasp three

> sorts of historical reality: the American past, to **comprehend the historical development and contemporary evolution of American society**; the Western, or European past, to **understand the political and legal foundations of United States society**; and the history of non-Europeans civilizations, **to recognize the influences that civilizations through time and place have had on each other.**[297]

Clearly, the AHA was concerned about the notion that the European traditions might predominate world history. The AHA's position on this issue became the most troublesome aspect of the entire standards-setting process and is the subject of further coverage in this study.

On May 1, 1992, the National Council for History Standards met to review the recommendations made by the members of the National Forum in their April 9-10 joint meeting. This meeting produced the first draft of the criteria that would guide the work of the Project. This first draft of criteria, as well as subsequent ones, provoked broad dialogue and open discussion of the issues of inclusiveness and the place of western civilization in the development of standards. The members of the National Council for History Standards represented all spectrums of history specialization as well as various and conflicting ideologies. Added to the rich diversity of the historians were the strong voices of teachers, curriculum specialists and administrators who never missed an opportunity to elaborate on the issues.

The National Council for History Standards drafted fifteen criteria for the development of national standards for history.

This first version of the criteria are known as the May 1, 1992, unedited version of the criteria:

1. Standards should be intellectually demanding, reflect the best historical scholarship, emphasize in-depth exploration rather than simplified coverage, and promote active questioning and learning rather than passive absorption of facts, dates, and names.

2. Such standards should be equally expected of all students with all students provided equal assess to the curricular opportunities necessary to achieving those standards.

3. Learning about the meanings and methods of history, based on such Standards, should begin at the earliest elementary school levels.

4. Standards should strike a balance between emphasizing broad themes in United States and world history and probing specific historical events, movements, persons, and documents.

5. The principles of sound historical reasoning - careful evaluation of evidence, construction of causal relationships, balance interpretations, and comparative analysis - should be reflected in Standards for history. Toward this end, the ability to detect and evaluate distortion and propaganda by selection, suppression or invention of facts is essential.

6. Standards should include awareness, appreciation for, and the ability to utilize a variety of sources of evidence from which historical knowledge is achieved, including written documents, oral tradition, literature, artifacts, art and music.

7. The history of any society can only be understood by studying all its constituent parts. As a nation - polity and society - the United States has always been both one and many. Therefore Standards for United States history should address the nation's common values and heritage and should reflect the nation's many-faceted diversity, defined by race, ethnicity, social status, gender, and religious affiliation. The contributions and struggles of specific groups should be included.

8. Standards in United States history should contribute to citizenship education through developing understanding of our common civic identity and shared civic values within the polity, and through developing

mutual respect between its component parts.

9. History Standards should emphasize the nature of civil society. Standards in United States history should address the history of the nation's democratic system, its historical origins and intellectual roots, and the continuing development of its ideals, institutions, and practices. United States history Standards should reflect the people, values, forces and institutions that have strengthened the democratic system, those that have weakened or violated it, and the successive reform movements that have worked to include those historically disenfranchised and excluded. Standards in world history should include the history of other democratic systems (e.g. European); the ideologies, institutions and practices that inform democratic and authoritarian forms of government; and the political aspirations of peoples in the nonwestern world.

10. Standards in the United States and world history should be separately developed but related.

11. Standards should include appropriate coverage of recent events in United States and world history, both in domestic political developments and in international relations of the post World War II era.

12. Standards in United States history should incorporate state and local history, both in terms of specific events (the 'smaller context and patterns of life') and the methods of case studies and historical research in the local setting.

13. Standards in world history should include both the history and values of western civilization and the history and cultures of other societies, with the greater emphasis on western civilization, and on the interrelationships between western and nonwestern societies.

14. Standards in United States and world history should include the history of religion.

15. Standards in United States and world history should include the history of ideas.[298] (Appendix I)

Research on the evolution of two of the fifteen criteria for standards produced further evidence concerning the controversial issues of inclusiveness in history and the place of Western

civilization in the curriculum. While the substance of many of the criteria remained unchanged through a series of examinations, the ones related to the inclusiveness issue in U.S. history and the place of western civilization in world history, went through a series of revisions in search of language and content that would make them acceptable to a broad consensus. Further study of the development of these criteria provided another way to examine the controversial issues which emerged during the writing of national standards for history and illustrate how building consensus affected the development of national standards for history.

For the purposes of this study, the word consensus has been taken to mean general agreement, the judgement arrived at by most of those concerned. The data examined reveals that the National History Standards Project was conceived and introduced as a consensus project. The entire ethos of the organization of the National History Standards Project, therefore, was built on the importance of reaching consensus, which the politics of reform and the politics of education required.

## BUILDING CONSENSUS

Previous propositions of this study examined the role of the structure and membership of the organization in the building of consensus, the constraints of the timetable of the organization toward building consensus, and the disparate and controversial issues which needed resolution by consensus. The fifth

proposition, that in order to set standards for history, efforts to build consensus will be expected of the participants, prompted the question how was consensus built? Answering this question required the examination of multiple sources of data including correspondence between the National History Standards Project and organizations or individuals communicating complaints or satisfaction regarding its work. This examination was conducted through interviews with participants interviewed for that purpose. To further illustrate the process of consensus building, this study traces the evolution of two controversial criteria for history standards, whose various revisions illustrate the consensus building process.

The examination of documentary data, including the archival records, participants reflections, and the revisions of Criteria 7 and 13, strongly indicates that the development of the national history standards was accomplished by building a broad consensus among historians, pre-collegiate teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, and a variety of cultural, ethnic, public and parochial educational organizations reaching thousands of people through their membership rosters.

Participants spoke candidly and openly about the process as one which encouraged diversity and the open exchange of ideas. With few exceptions, participants described the process as one of the most satisfactory group processes in which they had participated. Don Woodruff, a member of the Curriculum Task Force in world history, shared the view of many by rating the

process as very satisfactory. He expressed his enthusiasm about the project, saying:

> This is an incredible process. It has been invigorating and exciting. To have worked with so many wonderful people in an endeavor of this magnitude, and to see it develop from a blank sheet of paper into a credible document is what teaching is all about. The groups/individuals were wonderful to work with, and allowed me to develop new friendships around the country. As a result new partnerships between public and private schools may be formed, new joint endeavors by academic and corporate interests created, and a more appropriate manner of teaching history developed. This work cannot be set aside, but must be refined and used.[299]

According to Woodruff:

> Consensus was built by having the many different persons express their views on everything from process to implementation, and then having those administering the project establish the manner of addressing issues. Focus groups, councils, state organizations, etc...were contacted to obtain their views and expectations. The various beginning endeavors were shared with all constituencies (those concerned), and their input considered by staff and participants in developing the methodology for development of standards. The participants were included in decisions involving everything...Their views were respected and considered.[300]

Interviews conducted with other participants reveal that the majority, like Woodruff, found the experience of serving on the National History Standards Project to be among the most satisfactory professional endeavors they had engaged in. Like Woodruff, they also felt that consensus building grew naturally out of the openness of the process and the respect shown to all interest groups. Many also credited the leadership of the Project directors.

The comments of Joan Arno, curriculum task force member, are

representative of all the participants. Arno said, "We talked about it, made some tough decisions, put off some decisions for later, continued discussion. People talked openly and democratically."[301]

The comments of Linda Symcox, considering her vested interest as assistant director of the National History Standards Project, seemed to capture the views of many participants. Symcox worked with most groups developing the national history standards and experienced the process in many levels.

Symcox wrote:

> "For me consensus is achieved on many levels. The most obvious level is the dialogue that takes place at Council meetings and the decisions that are made as a result of that dialogue. At a similar level of importance would be the reports written by the participating Focus Groups which represent the deliberations which take place at their meetings. Without the agreement and support of these bodies, the project would not succeed. It is the responsibility of the administrators of the project to steer a course that equitably represents the concerns of these participants. At another level, a less visible one, consensus-building involves agreement among members of the Curriculum Task Forces who must negotiate their way through drafting standards in accordance with the guidelines set out by the Council. Each time a Task Force meets, the first day is spent achieving consensus. Without tacit agreement it would be very difficult for them to work towards a common goal. Through successive drafts of the standards the administrators of the Center must attempt to keep everyone's concerns in balance, without sacrificing the best principles of historical scholarship and teaching pedagogy. The consensus process must yield to these goals which are defined in the mission of this project. A third level of consensus-building is much less tangible than the others yet of utmost importance. It is fostering good relationships among the various participants in the project. Without good will and genuine respect in one-to-one relationships it would be impossible to create a cooperative spirit and a desire on the part of all to work for the collective good of the project. This ingredient is as important as efforts to achieve consensus on substantive issues because each person in the process quietly contributes to the whole. Each

> person in turn spreads the good will in their individual relationships as they come to consensus agreements with other members of the project."[302]

Not every participant agreed that the consensus-building process was a success. One member of the National History Standards Project, who wished to remain anonymous, expressed discontent with the fact that the U.S. government funded separate standards processes in history, civics, and geography. This respondent believes that the enormous amount of material coming out of three different, affiliated subject areas could be intimidating and counterproductive when it comes time to market and implement the national standards. [303]

This particular complaint, which was also registered by others, most of whom were outside of the National History Standards Project, remains unresolved. Another participant, who also wished not to be quoted, expressed doubt as to whether consensus was built. This participant also expressed concerns regarding content, the role of the directors and the usability of the standards.

In addition to conducting interviews with participants, this study examined the files of correspondence among Crabtree/Nash, various members of the National History Standards Project, and others not affiliated with the Project. This examination indicates that Crabtree and Nash tirelessly answered every complaint by offering reassurance or proofs to counter accusations or by simply accepting criticism and promising to act

on it.

One of the ways consensus was built was by defusing problems. The concerns of all affiliated groups were considered seriously by the co-directors of the National History Standards Project and every possible opportunity was given to them to re-evaluate the areas of their concern. While most groups participated fully and submitted their comments, praise and criticism in a collegial and consensus-building mode, the American Historical Association (AHA) was one Organizational Focus Group which defined its relationship with the National History Standards Project in less than collegial terms. In the opinion of most members of the National Council for History Standards, the position of the AHA became one of the most controversial issues and one which tested the limits of the consensus building process within the National History Standards Project.

The AHA had several complaints. One complaint was related to the AHA's perceived standing of itself within the project. In a letter dated November 24, 1992, Crabtree wrote to Blackey:

> Be assured of our desire for AHA's continued participation in the work of this Project. AHA was the first of the major organizations we approached when we first learned one year ago that we had been granted funding to conduct a broad based national consensus-building project to develop history standards for the nation's schools...We immediately approached the AHA Executive Directors inviting AHA's participation in the Project and invited Bill Leuchetenburg as the elected President of the AHA to serve on the National Council for History Standards, the governing board of the Project. Bill accepted at once, as did two past presidents of AHA, Akira Iriye and Bill McNeil...[304]

Blackey, in his response dated December 2, 1992, deferred to Gardner to refute Crabtree's point. In his letter dated December 2, 1992, Gardner wrote:

> First of all, we were not the first of the major organizations contacted regarding participation in the Project--indeed, I first heard about the project from NCSS, which had been invited to participate before we had even heard of the project. You did not contact either Sam Gammon (AHA Executive Director) or myself 'immediately'--we contacted you to find out what was going on and to expedite AHA Council action regarding the Association's role...As for the involvement of Bill Leuchtenburg, Bill McNeil, and Akira Iriye, we applaud your recruitment of these fine scholars as well as the involvement of many other valued AHA members. They serve, however, as individuals, not as AHA representatives, and the Association's only official voice has been through the staff and the focus group reports.[305]

Other procedural issues raised by the AHA were related to the standing of the pre-collegiate teachers within the Project, the AHA's objection to the rule which limited the AHA's and other Focus Groups' participation in the deliberations of the National Council for History Standards and the desire of the AHA to have its reports presented to the National Council for History Standards in their entirety instead of having them excerpted.

While the procedural issues were eventually resolved, the major issue raised by AHA became a source of contention and the subject of debate and protracted correspondence between Crabtree, Nash, and the AHA leadership. The disputed issue was the place of western civilization in the history standards. A serious issue, at the center of the historians' and teachers' dialogues, western civilization was personified in the embattled criterion 13 of the National History Standards Project.

The third way this researcher examined how consensus was built was by examining the evolution of criteria (7) and thirteen (13) for history standards through the various versions of the criteria as they went through debate, rewriting and review by the various groups which advised the National Council for History Standards. (Appendix F) Criteria 7 and 13 became symbols of the struggle to reach consensus on the language of the criteria which deal with inclusiveness in American history and the place of western civilization in world history.

The unedited May 1, 1992 version of criterion seven said:

> The history of any society can only be understood by studying all its constituent parts. As a nation - polity and society - the United States has always been both one and many. Therefore Standards for United States history should address the nation's common values and heritage and should reflect the nation's many faceted diversity, defined by race, ethnicity, social status, gender, and religious affiliation. The contributions and struggles of specific groups should be included.[306]

A statement stressing common values as well as diversity, criterion seven was amended following review and commentary by various individuals and groups. The amended version of criterion seven reads:

> The history of any society can only be understood by studying all its constituent parts. As a nation - polity and society - the United States has always been both one and many. Therefore standards for United States history should reflect the nation's diversity, exemplified by race, ethnicity, social status, gender, and religious affiliation. The contributions and struggles for social justice and equality by specific groups and individuals should be included.[307]

Omitted in this amended version of criterion seven is the reference to the nation's common values and heritage as it

appeared in the Criteria for Standards in the May 1, 1992 version.

By September 25, 1992, criterion seven read as follows:

> Standards for United States history should reflect the nation's diversity, exemplified by race, ethnicity, social status, gender, regional, political and religious views. The contributions and struggles of specific groups and individuals should be included.[308]

Shortened by about 40 words, the September 1992 version of criterion seven expressed some ideas similar to the May 1, 1992, version but was changed dramatically. It introduced two new ideas, regional differences and acknowledgement of the contribution of individuals. Missing from the September 1992, version of the criteria was any reference to the nation's common values and heritage.

The June 12, 1993, version of criterion seven shows yet another change.

> Standards for United States history should reflect both the nation's diversity, exemplified by race, ethnicity, social and economic status, gender, region, politics and religion, and the nation's commonalities. The contributions and struggles of specific groups and individuals should be included.[309]

In this June 12, 1993, version of criterion seven, the word commonalities replaced what was originally written as common values and heritage. The October Progress Report of the National History Standards Project shows criterion seven remaining unchanged since June 12, 1993.[310]

Reviewing the development of one criterion, the renditions of language used to express it, and by examining the final version, one gets a glimpse into the struggle over whose story

will be told and how.

Criterion thirteen also underwent a series of changes, following debate, exchanges of correspondence, review by the Organization Focus Groups and comments from many individuals. The intensity of the debate regarding the wording of criterion thirteen has been representative of the tension which permeates the profession regarding the teaching of world history and the position of western civilization in it. In order to illustrate the controversy regarding the place of western civilization in the curriculum, this study traced the various renditions of criterion thirteen, the correspondence related to it, and participants' accounts of the debates caused by criterion thirteen.

The May 1, 1992 rendition in criterion thirteen read:

> Standards in world history should include both the history and values for western civilization and the history and cultures of other societies, with the greater emphasis on western civilization, and on the interrelationship between western and non-western societies.[311]

On May 22, 1992, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development rejected criterion thirteen as it was written with the following comment and recommendations:

> Criterion 13: Adopting the criteria as it is now stated will open up a 'multicultural minefield'. The current emphasis among history and social studies teachers is to move away from an ethnocentric approach to history, and emphasizing western civilization over other societies contradicts the current thinking of many teachers. It is important that students display equal understanding of their own western values and culture as well as those on non-western societies.[312]

Responding to the criticism from the Association for

Supervision and Curriculum Development and other reviewers, criterion thirteen was revised by the National Council for History Standards. That amended version says:

> Standards of world history should include both the history and values of western civilization and the history and cultures of other societies, and the relations among them.[313]

The language of that version was unacceptable to some.

Another rendition of criterion thirteen was presented by the National Council for History Standards in its September 25 meeting:

> Standards in world history should include both the history and values of western civilization and the history and values of other civilizations, and should especially address the interactions among them.[314]

The American Historical Association found criterion thirteen problematic. Gardner wrote in a letter to Crabtree:

> In regard to the criteria for standards, we are troubled by the wording of number 13. It sets up an 'us and them' situation, which is not appropriate for the global perspective taken elsewhere and certainly is at odds with a multicultural perspective on the past. That is further aggravated by the indication that western civilization has 'values', but 'other' societies have only 'cultures'--I can assure you that such language will lead to problems in the long run...If the criteria are part of the material forwarded to the focus groups this fall and this sort of language is retained, then continued AHA involvement and support may become problematic, a situation that we would not like to see develop.[315]

The AHA's taking this position began a long and protracted correspondence between the National History Standards Project and the American Historical Association on this and other issues.

Blackey also communicated with Crabtree about his views on criterion thirteen:

> Jim Gardner wrote to you...regarding the potential problem the AHA has with the terminology in criterion 13. Indeed, the Teaching Division is adamantly opposed to the language, even as amended in September.[316]

Blackey closed his letter:

> ...we are not likely to support--and indeed we are likely to oppose publicly--any standards document that contains such flawed language. Please be clear that for us this is not a matter of semantics or politics but of historical thinking and conceptualization.[317]

The saga of criterion thirteen continued. Many of the reviewers commented on criterion thirteen and submitted their criticisms with instructions for change. The American Historical Association through its official correspondence with the National History Standards Project continued to object to the perceived prominence of western civilization in the wording of the criterion. In a letter dated December 2, 1992, Gardner again referred to criterion thirteen. Displeased with the September 25 rendition of criterion thirteen, Gardner wrote:

> While I did indeed indicate in July that I thought the project seemed in general to be on track, I also emphasized pointedly that continued AHA involvement would depend on appropriate revision of criterion 13...the point I raised involves more than just the use of the term 'values' and 'cultures' - the problem is the juxtaposing of western civilization with 'other' societies, perpetuating an 'us and them' situation...at no point did I assure <u>anyone</u> that the AHA would accept the revision passed by the National Council on the 25th (September).[318]

These objections to criterion thirteen were never taken lightly by the National History Standards Project. The AHA is a large organization of historians, and the success or failure of the standards especially at the acceptance and implementation level required building a broad consensus which included the AHA.

Criterion thirteen was reworded again. The last version of criterion thirteen as it was amended in July of 1993 says:

> Standards in world history should treat the history and values of diverse civilizations, including those of the West, and should especially address the interactions among them.[319]

The wording of criterion 13 was debated openly and fiercely by the members of the National Council for History Standards in its May 1, 1992 meeting. In subsequent meetings, the revision of criterion 13 required much time, energy, and emotion on the part of the members. When criterion 13 was sent out for review to the eight Organizational Focus Groups, only two of them returned comments about criterion 13 in their formal Focus Group Reports, while several individuals critisized the wording of the criterion. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development considered criterion 13 unacceptable as it was written and offered its reasons. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) did not comment on criterion 13. This researcher asked Ramsay Selden of the CCSSO how his organization felt about the controversy surrounding criterion 13, and he indicated that the CCSSO would not have initiated that controversy. While they were sympathetic to the arguments of those opposing its several renditions they were not equally concerned.[320]

Criterion 13 was the plank upon which the AHA built its position within the National History Standards Project. This position of the AHA is considered by many as one of the most unfortunate developments in the process of writing national

standards for history. Many were stunned, not by the stand taken by the AHA through its staff, but by its tactics. Even those who sympathized with AHA's interest in changing the tone of criterion 13 objected to the confrontational style AHA adopted. Historian Morton Keller looked at AHA's objections as political and attributed their position to the alliance between the ideologues and the bureaucrats within the AHA.[321]

Princeton historian Theodore Rabb described the AHA's behavior as "...deeply unpleasant, adversarial, personal, and scandalous."[322] A member of the AHA, Rabb did not consider the AHA dispute a serious intellectual dispute but one rooted in political correctness and not based on scholarship.[323]

While the directors of the National History Standards Project engaged in protracted correspondence with the AHA, several participants in the project corresponded privately with the AHA. Professor Rabb wrote Louise Tilly, president of the American Historical Association, a personal and unofficial letter in the hope that "such an informal action might help prevent a public and formal confrontation that would only damage history's standing in the schools."[324] Rabb addressed both the procedural and substantive concerns of the AHA. On the issue raised by the AHA concerning the position of Western civilization in the standards, Rabb wrote:

> The AHA Council's first concern...that those preparing standards are too Eurocentric, and are fashioning guidelines rooted in a Western perspective...I find beyond comprehension. Among the college teachers on the Standards Council, I am the only Europeanist, and on our specially convened eight-person world history Committee, I am also the sole European historian. I cannot imagine how anyone can believe that my specialty can outweigh (or even affect) the outlooks of such redoubtable colleagues as Akira Iriye, Carol Gluck, and William McNeil. Indeed, the dozens of responses to our earlier work that we received from interested organizations (e.g., the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education) never once raised that issue. It appeared only in the report sent by James Gardner on May 18th...[325]

Historian William McNeil, a member of the National Council for History Standards also expressed disappointment with AHA's methods of advocating its position. A proponent of teaching the history of the world and a critic of the often exalted place of western civilization, McNeil does not consider teaching both inclusively as antithetical. McNeil believes that we must teach western civilization, the relationship of the U.S. to western civilization, and the whole world.[326]

The latest version of criterion 13, from the October 1993 Progress Report of the National History Standards Project, bears only slight resemblance to earlier versions. While consensus has been reached on criterion 13, no one can be particularly proud of the result in this case. Written in language designed to put out the last sparks in the ashes of the culture wars, criterion 13 will be a constant reminder of those culture wars.

In the protracted dispute on three procedural issues and one substantive issue, the American Historical Association and

Crabtree/Nash exchanged correspondence which lasted from July 14, 1992 to April 1993 and covered several dozen pages.[327]

The prolonged dispute ended with a face to face meeting at the invitation of Crabtree and Nash to the directors and staff of the American Historical Association. While total agreement on the four disputed issues was not reached, the AHA informed its membership through its association's newsletter Perspectives of the satisfactory resolution of the procedural issues and continuing efforts to work toward resolution of the substantive issue which AHA saw as problematic.[328]

Those who defended the positioning of western civilization in a place of prominence as it is the civilization upon whose concepts of law, justice, and government, the United States has built its institutions, reluctantly accepted this last wording of criterion thirteen. It was the greatest sacrifice to consensus some of the participants could have made. According to David Battini, teacher and member of the National Council for History Standards, said that the process for developing history standards:

> ...has gone as far as I can be comfortable...we went overboard with trendy political stuff...American history is by definition multicultural - they (multiculturalists) turned it into ideology...It is not only the rhetorical trend that matters, but what they are trying to force on people...This is a European origin country with European notions of law...They are trying to say that all cultures are having parity...they are going to the mat for it...If they win, it is not just wording, it is a significant victory.[329]

Battini went on to say, "For political reasons, too much attention was spent on groups with ideological agendas."[330]

Peter J. Cheoros, a member of the Task Force in world history, agreed, saying:

> Our biggest problem was that a few people...seemed to want to eliminate all, or almost all references to European history. They seem to believe that all the problems of the world originated in Europe.[331]

Donald Woodruff also considered the issue of western civilization to be divisive, saying that several members of his task force think that "we have gone overboard the other way underemphasizing western civilization."[332]

To further examine the concensus building process for the development of national standards for history, this researcher analyzed the consensus building efforts of the National History Standards Project vis-a-vis the theoretical model adapted from C. W. Moore's The Mediation Process: Spheres of Conflict: Causes and Interventions.[333] The analysis of the data vis-a-vis the Spheres of Conflict: Causes and Interventions by C. W. Moore shows that the National History Standards Project followed a near textbook version of management of conflict. Crabtree and Nash, with their experience in other consensus building endeavors, understood the importance of collaboration in creating a consensus. (Appendix J)

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The process of building a wide consensus was not easy. That it would not be was clear from the onset of the Project, as indicated in proposition six, which states that even under the most optimum conditions for consensus building, some issues would remain less than satisfactorily resolved. The next question for

this study asks: Which issues remain problematic?

This researcher asked a group of participants that question, and answers varied depending on the affiliation of the person answering the question. Issues that seemed satisfactorily resolved to some were not satisfactorily resolved for others. Unsurprisingly, two issues were most frequently cited as remaining unresolved. The first was the place of western civilization in the world history curriculum. The second was how the standards would be implemented.

Among those for whom the place of western civilization in the world history curriculum remains a problem are Woodruff, Pyne, E. Bell and David Baumbach. According to Pyne, "the question has come down as to whether Western history is shortchanged."[334] Baumbach, mentioning the battle over criterion 13 said, "It appears that the AHA support for the standards project is not completely in place. It is important to recognize that the AHA is only one focus group."[335]

The larger concern for participants who worked so hard to build consensus and write standards seemed to be the implementation of those standards. Among the obstacles to implementation mentioned by such participants as Battini, Arno, E. Bell, Pedro Castillo, Diane Brooks and Reed were the sheer size of the product, the reaction of the state departments of education and state governors to the standards, and the recalcitrance of the social studies establishment itself.

On the issue of size, Arno said, "I am concerned that people

will be overwhelmed by it."[336] E. Bell called the size of the final standards project a "big issue dimly understood."[337] Brooks questioned the feasibility of accomplishing all the standards, saying, "the reality of some states meeting these challenging standards is a question,"[338] even if students are given three years of U.S. history instruction and three years of world history instruction.

Battini wondered how the "effort [of the National History Standards Project] will mesh with the governors, etc." [339] Ravitch said it would be "bizarre" to have national standards in history and not to have state, as well.[340]

Reed also voiced concerns about the reaction of the social studies establishment. According to Reed, the obstacles to implementation will be the social studies community, including colleges of education which traditionally take an anti-standards approach.[341]

Vigilante affirmed the view of many experienced teachers when he refused to accept the notion that implementation problems will arise because the history standards are overwhelming. He said:

> Another issue is implementation. We are concerned that without proper implementation much effort to improve the teaching of history will be lost. The central issue which appears to continue to haunt the project is the mathematical division of performance standards by the number of teaching days. I have difficulty in accepting this as a legitimate issue. The Standards are not check-lists; they are interrelated. Teaching is multi-leveled, it can not be reduced to a mathematical formula based on item by item analysis. The Standards were developed by individuals with years of practical experience and reviewed by a panel of teachers, curriculum coordinators, and

> college and university professors. They reflect consensus on attainable student outcomes.[342]

Arno captured the feelings of many participants when she concluded:

> My feeling is that the National Standards are an idea whose time has come. The public politicians, and those in education, are looking for direction in making history education both inclusive and a true challenge. These standards go a long way in establishing quality education for the twenty-first century.[343]

The effort to develop national standards in history is unprecedented. The task of the National History Standards Project was a historic one, and its product will affect the teaching of history, the textbook publishing industry, the education of teachers and the way we as a nation see ourselves and the world.

The National History Standards Project will set a historic precedent for any country in the world which may look for a model for developing standards for the teaching of history. The final product is in the final editing stage, and will be presented, if all goes well, in the summer of 1994. It will not be a perfect document, but it will be a living document. It will be the product of a process called consensus, created by reasonable people to discuss critical issues and to reach general agreements on subjects on which perfect agreements could never be reached.

The last proposition of this study states that building consensus to set standards for history can become a model for other standards setting organizations. The question then is:

How might the consensus building process of the National History Standards Project be applied to similar situations?

## THE NATIONAL HISTORY STANDARDS PROJECT: A MODEL FOR STANDARDS-SETTING ORGANIZATIONS

Setting precedents and referring to them to enlighten future attempts of similar tasks is one way which organized societies link their past with their present. The National History Standards Project in its monumental effort to establish national standards in history for our nation's schools studied the precedents set by similar, smaller attempts in the past. The California effort which produced History - Social Studies Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve became one of the models informing the direction of the National History Standards Project. The lessons learned from the experience of the New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee also provided direction for the National History Standards Project, if not in anything else, in the importance of striving for broad consensus and the dangers of not reaching one. The consensus project followed by the National Council for Education Standards and Testing in achieving its mission, as it was prescribed by the U.S. Congress, was also studied and emulated in part by the National History Standards Project. Furthermore, the experiences of the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in its successful process of developing mathematics standards by consensus of the scholars and

professionals in the field of mathematics provided a paradigm for the National History Standards Project. The NCTM, the pioneers in the U.S. for setting national standards for math, had developed a process which was available to anyone interested in examining the product of their work, the lists of participants, and the testimonies of the major players who were often asked to testify as to how they arrived at the standards for mathematics.

The National History Standards Project also learned from NCTM's mistakes, one of which the NCTM acknowledges to be its failure to gather baseline data indicating where schools were at the time of the release of the national standards in mathematics.

In an interview, Marilyn Hala from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) discussed the problem they faced in answering the often-asked question, what difference do the mathematics standards make? In retrospect, Hala thinks that the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics should have collected data indicating where schools were at the time of the release of the mathematics standards. It would have been important to know how teachers prepared for instruction, to have teacher action data.[344] Hala believes that there is ample time for all the national standards projects to gather that information prior to releasing their standards for implementation.[345]

Besides the precedents which guided its work, the National History Standards Project created traditions which are expected to set precedents in both style and substance. The National History Standards Project intimately involved close to two

hundred professionals and indirectly involved thousands in the development of history standards. Its communications were open and public, and its archives including many thousands of pages and many hours of tapes could fill a modest library. The National History Standards Project dispatched teams of teachers to various conferences of educators to expose the history standards to wide review and commentary, thus familiarizing large numbers of people with what was happening and receiving rich advice and direction.

Another significant precedent set by the National History Standards Project was its choice to proceed in a non-confrontational manner with the AHA which, among all affiliated organizations, absorbed the most attention of the National History Standards Project. It would have been just as easy for the directors of the National History Standards Project to choose to confront the AHA in a public conference as it would have been for the AHA to publicly denounce the National History Standards Project. To the credit of the directors of the National History Standards Project, they chose the consensus-building process. Since the directors, Crabtree and Nash, believed that the AHA's desires were not different from those of the National History Standards Project, they devoted tremendous resources to resolving the conflict in the most collegial manner possible. The AHA's position must be understood from their perspective. To their credit, AHA articulated their complaints and defended their positions in the most steadfast manner. Examining whether the

AHA designees to the National History Standards Project represented the views of the AHA membership could be the subject of another study. What is clear from the data of this study is that the AHA representatives did not withdraw from their articulated beliefs.

Another precedent set by the National History Standards Project was the wide dissemination of information. The latest technology was used to send information to large numbers of people. The attention paid by the National Council for History Standards to the politics of education is also instructional for any group of people undertaking a similar project in the future. Crabtree and Nash kept all participants informed regarding congressional legislation, the National Goals Panel Reports, media reports, and information generated from professional organizations.

A significant precedent set by the National History Standards Project was the decision to involve a large number of pre-collegiate teachers in the process. This group of approximately fifty professionals worked with the historians to create the national standards for history for the students they know so well in our nation's schools. Theirs are the surest and most convincing voices of praise for the process of developing national standards for history.

From December of 1991, when Crabtree received the grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Department of Education and began the National History Standards Project, she

and Nash have maintained a professional and collegial demeanor. Under their direction, the National History Standards Project created a paradigm which could be used by any similar standards setting process.

Asked to suggest how the process used by the Hational History Standards Project might have been improved, most participants interviewed expressed satisfaction and praised the process. Among those who offered suggestions for improvement, two main themes dominated: the role and treatment of Focus Groups and the constraints of time.

Ramsay Selden of the Council of Chief State School Officers and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, historian, addressed concerns about the Focus Groups. Selden said the Focus Groups often felt that they were not heard and said we needed "to convey the message that people were heard and were taken seriously."[346] Fox-Genovese, on the other hand, felt that the role of the Focus Groups was never clear and that Crabtree, who she says cares deeply about legitimacy, allowed the focus groups to play too much of a role.[347]

Fred Risinger and Arno are concerned about the tremendous amount of material coming out of history, geography, and civics standards. Risinger would appoint a new group with no relation to any of the standards projects groups to review the work and create a synthesis document.[348] Arno would allow time for review of the working documents by those who developed (them) and by...specialists (content area and educators)...so that the

documents can be tightened up.[349]

Other suggestions for improving the process came from the historian Theodore Rabb and Battini. Rabb feels the world history standards lack coherence and do not match the standards of U.S. history. He attributed this to two factors. First, according to Rabb, the world history committee did not have at its core the same degree of constant leadership and direction that the U.S. history committee did, and second, none of the world history professors who worked with the teachers writing the standards were members of the National Council for History Standards.[350] For his part, Battini says that if he had it to do over again:

> I would be more open and forward about the controversies and perhaps the ulterior motives of those who objected. Not let the tails wag the dog. Concurrent majority is not necessary to build a consensus.[351]

# CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The task of developing national standards for history, mathematics, geography, science, English, the arts, civics, and foreign languages has been a monumental and historic. The effort itself suggests that at the dawn of a new century, we are taking the time to examine where we have been and where we are going as a nation. As a member of the National Council for Education Standards and Testing, the History Task Force, and the National Council for History Standards, this researcher saw her participation in the creation of national standards for history as a unique opportunity to redefine what we believe in and what we believe is important to teach our children. Creating history standards was both an intellectual and an emotional endeavor.

In the most characteristic American way, participants debated publicly their thoughts and their beliefs. Participants were inspired by the distinct voices of writers such as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. who in his book The Disuniting of America says:

> The genius of America lies in its capacity to forge a single nation from people of remarkably diverse racial, religious, and ethnic origins. It has done so because democratic principles provide both the philosophical bond of union and practical experience in civic participation. The American Creed envisages a nation composed of individuals making their own choices and accountable to themselves, not a nation based on inviolable ethnic communities.[352]

> Our schools and colleges have a responsibility to teach history for its own sake - as part of the intellectual

> equipment of civilized persons - and not to degrade history by allowing its contents to be dictated by pressure groups, whether political, economic, religious or ethnic. The past may sometimes give offense to one or another minority; that is no reason for rewriting history. Giving pressure groups veto over textbooks and courses betrays both history and education.[353]

Voices such as Schlesinger's gave credence to many educators' beliefs that the task of writing standards for history:

> ...is to combine due appreciation of the splendid diversity of the nation with due emphasis on the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy, and human rights. These are the ideas that define the American nationality - and that today empower people of all continents, races and creeds.[354]

Participants were also inspired by the voices of others who represented an America often forgotten or misunderstood. We are the richer, for instance, for having heard Clifford E. Trafzer, an American Indian historian, who discussed the point of view of Native Americans contained in the rich oral history passed down from one generation of Native American to another. Trafzer talked about that other kind of history told in the form of legends:

> Native Americans elders argued and continue to maintain that their old stories are not myths but are historical texts that place Indians in the Americas at the time of creation when people moved about--sometimes from one world to the next and had a spiritual relationship with the earth, animals, plants, and places near their original homes. National standards must require an understanding of the Native American view of origin, and this theory of origin should be included with other theories of Native American origin.[355]

While very different voices, Schlesinger's and Trafzer's messages were not antithetical.

The national history standards were shaped by historians and teachers in part out of the testimonies of all those who addressed their particular concerns, some with passion, others with anger, most with eagerness to make a difference. The voice that captured the spirit of the National History Standards Project was that of Clifford E. Trafzer when he said:

> In creating national standards for the teaching of history in the schools, we must be as generous and giving as Mouse in the ancient Snohomish Indian story. When Mouse saw Wolf he was very frightened until Mouse realized that Wolf was blind. The great animal had lost his way because he had lost his sight. So, small and insignificant Mouse, did something magnanimous. He gave his eyes to Wolf so that the mighty animal might find his direction. As a result, Wolf could see, and he asked Mouse to join him on life's journey. They became friends and partners, always helping one another. Then one day Mouse went through a transformation. His forearms elongated into wings, and his hind legs became talons. His nose extended and became a beak, and, most importantly, his eyes became part of his face. Mouse became Eagle, the all seeing winged and sacred bird.
>
> The teaching of history in the schools is like Wolf. It is a great animal that has lost its direction. So like Mouse, the National Forum For History Standards offers its collective sight so that together we can create national standards that will strengthen our students, teachers, and society. Then like Mouse, the teaching of history in the schools will be transformed. Like the magnificent Eagle, it will soar and grow with greater insights and new views which will benefit all people of the United States.[356]

It must be noted, for the sake of the record and for the benefit of future studies of the development of history standards, that valiant efforts were made by the participants of the National History Standards Project to broaden the scope of U.S. history and to make a course in world history truly a history of the world.

Those who addressed inclusion, spoke with reason and feeling and passion not about parity, but about inclusion. Most of those who were determined that world history should be a study of all civilizations did not advocate dethroning European civilization or thought, but rather supported telling the world's story from a perspective free of the traditional biases of the past.

Similarly, those who spoke with emotion and assurance about the prominence that the study of western civilization should have in the history education of American students, did so out of their conviction that the ideas of western civilization gave life and foundation to our American political democratic heritage. They were concerned as were such signatories of Education For Democracy: A Statement of Principles, a project of the American Federation of Teachers, signed by a large and diverse group of notable Americans including Marian Wright Edelman, Jimmy Carter, Henry Cisneros, Chester E. Finn, Jr., Mary Hatwood Futrell, Clairborne Pell, William McNeil, Walter Mondale, and Arthur Ashe:

> ...that among some educators (as among some in the country at large) there appears a certain lack of confidence in our own liberal, democratic values, an unwillingness to draw normative distinctions between them and the ideas of non-democratic regimes. Any number of popular curriculum materials deprecate the open preference for liberal democratic values as 'ethnocentric'.[357]

The advocates of including the study of western civilization in the education of every American child spoke with confidence on behalf of the liberal democratic traditions of the West while defending the need to tell America's and the world's story in its

rich diversity.

The national standards for history were written to the specification of the national call to create dynamic and rigorous standards for all the nation's children in the subject of history. The standards reflect the views of historians and teachers about the role of history in our schools and in a democratic society such as ours.

In a personal interview, Diane Ravitch discussed history standards and her vision of history in our schools. Ravitch said that she was pleased the National Education Goals included history as one of the core subjects. History, according to Ravitch, used to be the center of the social studies but had become peripheral. Ravitch said the development of national history standards was a non-political, non-ideological issue. Her vision for history in the nation's schools includes "strengthening the field of history and building a valid consensus process, inclusive of organizations like the NCSS, to create the standards."[358] The national history standards represent the best effort of historians and teachers to strengthen history in the schools and were written in a valid consensus process as Ravitch envisioned.

Elizabeth Fox-Genovese captured the spirit of the effort to set national standards in history when she wrote:

> The great value of the standards lies in their opening a dialogue with teachers. We have never intended them to serve as lesson plans, but to raise questions and to propose new ways of looking at familiar topics. Throughout, the standards are informed by a sense of respect for teachers as intellectuals and historians.

> Above all, they take the work of teachers seriously, assuming that each teacher will pick and choose among the suggestions and use the standards as a resource. We know that the complete standards contain more than any person to cover in one year, but that is certainly the point. For by offering more than any one person can do they engage teachers in a common reflection about the significance of history and teaching. I, at least, assume that teachers will come back to the standards, trying one thing one year, another thing another year. But the existence of the standards should encourage teachers to see their work in the classroom as a continuing discussion with history as a changing, dynamic field that only attains its true importance when it is imaginatively taught.[359]

## CONCLUSIONS

This research tells the story of the National History Standards Project and the way consensus was built in the development of national standards for history. The study links the National History Standards Project with the educational reform movement which began with The National Commission on Excellence in Education's report, A Nation At Risk, as well as with the ten year long debates about the status of the study of history in America's schools. This research has been developed according to the established protocol of propositions to be examined and questions to be asked. Faithful to its design principles, which are based on Robert K. Yin's theories about case studies, this study creates a chain of evidence built with explicit links between the questions asked, the data collected and the conclusions drawn. The multiple sources of evidence converge on the same findings.

The examination of multiple data and the purposeful group

interviews corroborate the evidence, thus fulfilling the ultimate goal of any research, which in the words of Yin is "to treat the evidence fairly, to produce compelling analytic conclusions, and to rule out alternative interpretations."[360]

The conclusion reached in this study is that the National History Standards Project developed national standards for history achieving a substantial, broad consensus of historians, professional associations, pre-collegiate teachers, and a wide spectrum of civic, educational, professional and minority associations who were asked to offer their perspectives.

The National History Standards Project fulfilled its mission of reaching broad consensus on the contentious issues of content versus process, the place of western civilization in the teaching of world history, and the inclusion of minority contributions in the teaching of U.S. history. The army of participants in the process represented as broad a spectrum as one could expect to find in a project with limited time and resources, and the resulting national history standards are truly the product of their consensus.

The majority of participants involved in the National History Standards Project whom I interviewed identified implementation as the biggest challenge remaining. Most participants acknowledge that a national plan is needed to ensure that the work of all the standards projects will be channeled properly into our nation's schools.

One obstacle to the implementation of the national standards

for history may be the political make up of the social studies establishment itself, which may continue to debate why history, among all of the social studies, was one of the three for which national standards should be written. Down offers a response:

(1.) History, by its recognition of the influence of the past on the present, helps a student place contemporary events in a meaningful context.

(2.) History, by its insistence on close reading, offers unparalleled opportunity to develop the skills of critical thinking, expository analysis and the ability to synthesize alternative explanations of the same phenomenon.

(3.) History is truly a generative subject in the sense that it enables people to enjoy the capacity for life-long learning by providing access to other subjects.

(4.) History by its nature presupposes an understanding of geography, civics and economics - thus making it an excellent sample of intergrated learning.

(5.) History, by its study of human behavior reinforces the moral assumptions inherent in a sound education by fostering an appreciation for what constitutes responsible citizenship in a given society.

(6.) History, by its reliance on overarching cultural principles, enables a student to approach the discipline, with both an appreciation of diversity and a recognition of those values of particular importance to the American experience.[361]

Policy makers have been talking in the last few years about systemic reform. Marshall Smith, former dean of the School of Education at Stanford University and now Under-Secretary with the U.S. Department of Education, says systemic reform is a strategy which "includes three major components: a unifying vision and goals, a coherent instructional guidance system, and a restructured governance system."[362]

Dwight W. Allen, professor of education at Old Dominion University, writes in Schools For A New Century: A Conservative Approach to Radical School Reform:

> There is no agreement on what the problems facing our schools are, let alone the possible solutions - only that there are overwhelming barriers to overcome. The solutions proposed, and even implemented in the latest of the endless rounds of educational reform, have not made much difference. Our country desperately needs a systematic educational reform framework from which a charter for the new century's education can emerge.[363]

Allen proposes that reform must be tried out in a network of experimental schools. He favors:

> A nationwide system of schools with a balance of national, state, and local control, having a predictable framework and allowing long-term experimentation and program evaluation. Participation by both staff and students in such a network would be entirely voluntary, so no one would be placed at risk without agreement. In fact, I predict that there would be great competition to become part of a national experimental schools network, both at the community and individual levels.[364]

In an interview, historian Morton Keller, a member of the National Council for History Standards, discussed his concerns regarding the dissemination of national standards for history. In a similar vein to Allen's, Keller suggested that the standards should be implemented in pilot sites in order to test how they work and make the necessary updates before offering them to the entire nation.[365]

The National Education Goals Panel has been preparing for the implementation of the national standards from all the disciplines which are currently writing standards. Anticipating the authorization of the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), which will review and certify

content standards, the National Education Goals Panel "convened a Technical Planning Group to advise it regarding the criteria and procedures by which education standards might be reviewed and certified."[366]

Further complicating the implementation of standards is a political wedge. "Goals 2000," President Clinton's educational legislation, mentions opportunity-to-learn (OTL) standards; that is, standards which will guarantee that a student will have the opportunity to achieve the proposed content and performance standards.[367]

As with other issues, this debate is complex. While many consider OTL standards a necessary part of educational reform, others consider it another effort to derail the excellence reform movement. Finally, if these issues were not enough of an impediment, some critics still believe the national standards are an effort that needs to be stopped.

In an article in Basic Education entitled "National Standards: A Contrary View," Dennis Gray condemns national standards, the standards setters, the way schools teach, the way subjects are distinguishable by discipline, academics, and much more. He says:

> If the standards setters were thinking of real students, real needs, and real life, what should they be doing? First, they should conduct broadly-based conversations aiming toward restructuring curricula to breach discipline-drown boundaries. They should focus instead on the qualities and habits that ought to characterize worthy graduates of public schools. The new focus should liberate the dialogue from control of subject-matter tories and should require the inclusion of broad-gauged generalists to argue the results that apply across

> traditional academic borders. Doing so would necessitate a radical shift away from the current approach to national standards, which is producing prodigious lists of outcomes that one might expect from hard-working graduate students in conventionally organized universities. Such standards can only bury schooling more deeply in a past already gone bust.[368]

Francie Alexander refutes the critics by showing how national standards are good for educators, good for students, good for schools, and superior to the "flawed, de facto standards we have now...that come from standardized tests, textbooks, and instructional materials" and have been imposed on educators.[369] Citing the NCTM standards as an example, Alexander said:

> "I want there to be national standards, passionately and vigorously, if they're good standards. What excites me about [the standards movement] is the opportunity for us to shape the standards, as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics did. It's an invitation to have a professional conversation.[370]

According to Alexander, having such a conversation and setting national standards will allow educators to reclaim their profession.

Alexander believes that national standards in history will help all students by providing them with an equal opportunity to learn. Presently she says:

> Only a small percentage of high school kids in this country really know what their standards are, because they're set by institutions of higher education. These students know precisely what they have to do... However, for far too many kids in this country, the standards are too low.[371]

Alexander argues that a common set of standards for all students will equalize expectations and help students and their teachers understand what they need to accomplish.

Alexander also believes that national standards will result in equity in the schools and create equal opportunity to learn:

> "The way we're going to get at equal opportunity is by knowing where we want to go...I think we're going to have a lot more success [generating] the political will to get the job done if we can describe what the job is. If you can clearly describe an educated person so that everyone says, 'That's what I want my son or daughter to be like,' then I think you're going to get the will... If you want support for the resources that are needed, you have to be able to say, 'These are the resources it's going to take, this is the program it's going to take- if we want all of our kids to have those abilities'."[372]

Alexander believes national standards will create the public support that will result in a demand for equitable conditions in schools so that every child can become well-educated.[373]

As critics and proponents of national standards debate among themselves one thing becomes crystal clear, the implementation of the national history standards, as well as the standards from all the other sanctioned projects, will be a delicate task.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESEARCH

This research examines the process of consensus building for the development of national standards in history. It apparently is the only research of its kind since standards writing projects are a new phenomenon on the national level and public interest regarding national standards is also new.

The National Council of Mathematics Teachers' project is one of the pioneering efforts in development of national standards in this country. It has not been studied methodically however, and with the exception of a plethora of articles in various journals

each covering a distinct view of the math standards, there is no research examining the entire process and and the issues involved in establishing standards for mathematics.

Apparently the story of standards-setting has not been told systematically in any country where such a process has taken place. This study contributes to the research literature by documenting the process by which the National History Standards Project operated, the people and the organizations involved, the controversial issues which arose and the way consensus was built. Future researchers will have the advantage of studying this consensus process, thus having a point of reference that this researcher was not able to find in current literature.

This research also answers legitimate questions which will surface when the National History Standards are publicly released in the late summer of 1994. Members of the educational community will not only find the answers to who, what, when, where, why and how in regard to the development of national standards for history, but they will also be able to share in the vision and the struggle, the pain and the success as well as the limitations of a project of such magnitude and importance. Specifically, this study provides eye-witness perspectives on questions regarding the controversial issues which had to be settled in order to develop national standards for history. This research addresses the question of process and content, which divides the profession, articulating how a harmonious resolution of that issue was developed, and where disagreements exist.

This research addresses the question of how diversity and inclusion were handled in the development of history standards. Furthermore, the study elaborates on the question of the place of western civilization in the world history curriculum, and it provides a bird's eye view of the debates, articulations, and decisions made on the issues.

Important contributions have been made by pre-collegiate teachers as writers of the standards. This should quiet the fear, and the occasionally cynical remarks, of those who say that standards are written by people who know nothing about the realities of the American classroom. In addition, this research documents the educational history of our nation in the making: the unprecedented collaboration of scholars, historians and pre-collegiate teachers for the development of national history standards.

This research will inform the textbook industry of the background debates and commentary in the development of the standards. The fragile consensus built on the place of western civilization in world history should raise a red flag in the textbook industry should it have an inclination either to undermine or exalt western civilazation. Textbook publishers should read carefully the comments of such professors as Rabb and McNeil, teachers Battini and Bell, and others such as Gardner and Blackey of the American Historical Association. Pre-collegiate teachers should be informed that this research offers a view of the standards. It shows the National History Standards Project

as an attempt to place in the hands of pre-collegiate history teachers the best content and performance standards ever articulated by a consensus of historians and teachers on the national level, as well as the richest suggested resources to supplement and integrate the teaching of history.

Schools of education and history departments will find here an inside view of a process whose product, the development of national history standards, will necessitate change in the preparation of teachers.

Other disciplines and states can use this information as they plan to proceed with their own standards projects. States could save money, resources, time and energy by consulting the costly work of the National History Standards Project, thus avoiding reinvention of the wheel in the area of standards state by state, district by district, school by school.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Seeking national consensus on content and performance standards for history, mathematics, foreign languages, the arts, civics, geography, English, and science, is a new and serious engagement for American scholars and educators. It is a field of research wide open for studies which will increase our understanding of what is most important for our students to know, how we will transmit knowledge to future generations, and how meaningful consensus will be built to accomplish it. With this in mind, this researcher have several recommendations for future

studies:

1. A comparative study of the history curricula of Japan, Nigeria, Germany, Russia, Egypt and/or other nations to determine how other countries approach the teaching of their own national history and the history of the World.

2. A series of studies documenting the process of writing national standards in science, English, mathematics, the arts, civics, geography, and foreign languages in the United States.

3. A series of studies to determine how teachers were prepared and how students were taught prior to the implementation of national standards in each of the disciplines and how that might change.

4. A study to determine whether the attention to issues of ethnic diversity and inclusiveness in the new national history standards includes such ethnic minorities such as Germans, Italians, Greeks, Irish Catholics, and Norwegians.

5. A series of studies of such groups as first generation immigrants from European, African, Asian, and South American nations to determine their expectations about the teaching of history in the schools.

6. A study to determine how our schools can more effectively teach patriotism and a balanced patriotism.

7. A series of studies to research if and how other countries teach patriotism.

8. A comparative study of the history curricula of the United States, Canada, and Australia to research what each teach and how

each approaches the issue of common values and heritage.

9. A study to research American students' ideas about common values and heritage.

10. A study of various ethnic, religious and cultural minorities to determine ideas of each regarding common values and heritage.

11. A study of world history curricula from various countries to determine the placement of each country's history and heritage within its world history curriculum.

12. A study of the national history standards to determine the treatment of world religions.

13. Studies of consensus building in educational settings.

14. A series of comparative studies of history classrooms using traditional history curricula and the new national standards for history.

15. A study to determine the attitudes of professors of education regarding the national standards in the various disciplines.

16. A study to determine the attitudes of professors of history regarding the national history standards, and how they plan to change the curriculum for the education of teachers of history.

17. A study of a group of beginning history teachers (years 1-3) and a group of veteran history teachers (15 or more years) to compare their reactions to the national history standards.

# EPILOGUE

Consensus-building in the development of history standards was a difficult but necessary process. Upon completion, the national standards will have to meet the criteria suggested by the Technical Planning Review Group of the National Education Goals Panel. One of the criteria is consensus, about which the Technical Planning Review says:

> Standards should result from reasonable and inclusive process. Consensus should be sought in an iterative process of broad comment, feedback, and support from professionals and the general public at the school, neighborhood, community, state and national levels. Those applying for standards certification should indicate who was involved in the process, how they were involved, what aspects of the final and interim products were reviewed, and what resulted.[374]

The struggle to articulate the criteria for history standards was inevitable and therapeutic. In the traditional American practice of open discourse, some of the best of America's historians and educators tried to settle the questions which needed settlement. Criteria 1-15 may not be the best articulation for history standards, but they tell a story of a free people trying to redefine who they are and how they should look at the world.

There is no doubt in this participant-observer's mind that anyone involved will leave that process changed. The experience of listening to the testimonies of the representatives of the National Forum caused a swelling of emotions regarding the beliefs, hopes, and aspirations of the groups that make America.

Only a steel heart and a closed mind would have been untouched by both those who articulated the idea of E Pluribus Unum, and those who simply asked: let my people in America's story. Listening to each other was an unprecedented experience. This participant-observer watched historians whose work commands attention around the world struggle with words, read them aloud and try again and again to craft in soothing language the way history ought to be told according to today's revisionist standards.

The National History Standards Project will complete its work by the fall of 1994. Some of the concerns expressed by the participants regarding the history standards may be resolved by that time. A true epilogue to this research will be added at that time, and the story of building a consensus for the development of history standards will be then complete.

## Notes

1. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools, 7.

2. Ibid., 7.

3. Robert K. Yin, (1989), Case Study Research, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 146.

4. Bruce L. Wilson and Gretchen B. Rossman, (1993), Mandating Academic Excellence: High School Response to State Curriculum Reform, New York: Teacher's College Press, 201.

5. Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., (1987), What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 132-133.

6. Chester E. Finn, Jr., (1989, Fall), "National Standards: A Plan for Consensus," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 3.

7. Maurice R. Berube, (1991), American Presidents and Education, New York: Greenwood Press, 16.

8. Diane Ravitch, (1984, Spring), "The Continuing Crisis: Fashions in Education," The American Scholar, 191-192.

9. Ibid., 191.

10. Ibid., 192.

11. Ibid., 192.

12. National Commission on Excellence in Education, (1983, April), A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 5.

13. Ibid., 5.

14. Ernest L. Boyer, (1983), High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

15. "Charting A New Course for Reform: A Chronology," (1993, February 10), Education Week: Special Report, S4.

16. Wayne Riddle, James Stedman, and Paul Irwin, (1991, October 3), National Education Goals: Federal Policy Issues, Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, 2.

18. National Education Goals Panel, (1992), The National Education Goals Report, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, xi.

19. America 2000: An Education Strategy, (1991), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

20. Ibid., 13.

21. Office of the Press Secretary, (1991, June 17), "Remarks by the President In Address to Grand Junction Community." Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2.

22. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, (1992, January 24), Raising Standards for American Education, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1.

23. Ibid., 1.

24. Ibid., H1-L4.

25. National Education Goals Panel, (1991, September 30), "News Conference: Release of First Report," Washington, D.C.: National Press Club, 2.

26. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, C-1. See also National Council for Education Standards and Testing, (1991, September 27-28), "Summary of Public Comment," Des Moines, Iowa: National Education Forum.

27. U.S. Department of Education (1993, October 5), The Goals 2000: Educate America Act: Making American Education Great Again, Washington, D.C., 2.

28. U.S. Department of Education, (1993, November 12), Standards For All: A Vision for Education in the 21st Century, Washington, D.C., 1.

29. U.S. Department of Education (1993, September 23), "Riley Asks Congress for Sweeping Improvements in School Programs for the Poor," Washington, D.C., 2 & 3.

30. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, H1-L4.

31. Ibid., K1-K3.

32. Ibid., 8.

33. Federal News Service, (1992, January 24), "National Council on Education Standards and Testing News Conference," Washington,

D.C.: Federal Information Systems Corporation, 7.

34. Chester E. Finn, Jr., (1991), We Must Take Charge: Our Schools and Our Future, New York: The Free Press

35. Dwight W. Allen, (1992), Schools for a New Century, New York: Praeger Publishers, 2.

36. Maurice R. Berube, American Presidents and Education, 152.

37. Charles S. Thompson and Edward C. Rathmell, (1988, May), "NCTM's Standards for School Mathematics, K-12," Mathematics Teacher, 81 (5), 348.

38. Federal News Service, (1991, December 16), "Education Standards News Conference," Washington, D.C.: Federal Information Systems Corporation, 22-34.

39. Ibid., 23.

40. Charlotte Crabtree, (1991, November 5), Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs, Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in Schools, 3 & 4.

41. Ibid., 4.

42. History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee, (1987), History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education.

43. Ibid., 10.

44. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 6.

45. Debra Viadero, (1992, March 4), "Diverse Group Begins Process of Developing Standards for History," Education Week, 80.

46. Ibid., 80.

47. Ibid., 80.

48. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, D-1 to D-4.

49. Ibid., D-2

50. Ibid., 1.

51. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 32.

52. Ibid., 7.

53. Ibid., 9.

54. Ibid., 9.

55. Ibid., 9.

56. Ibid., 9.

57. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, E-4.

58. Ibid., E-4

59. Phillip Babcock Gore, (1969), Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 497.

60. Ibid., 241.

61. Diane Ravitch, editor, (1990) The American Reader, New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 80-81.

62. Thomas H. Kean, (1989, October 31), "Remarks," Washington, D.C.,: Fortune Magazine Education Summit, 1 & 2.

63. Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr., (1989, September), unpublished paper entitled "Thomas Jefferson on Public Education and an Enlightened Society: Selected Quotations," Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, 2.

64. Bruce L. Wilson and Gretchen B. Rossman, Mandating Academic Excellence, 1.

65. Thomas E. McCollough, (1991), The Moral Imagination and Public Life, Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 91.

66. National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation At Risk, 27.

67. Ibid., 32.

68. Ibid., 36.

69. Chester E. Finn, Jr., (1983, April), "The Drive for Educational Excellence: Moving Toward A Public Consensus," Change 15 (3), 14.

70. Dwight W. Allen, Schools For A New Century, 6.

71. Terrel H. Bell, (1993, February 22), "A Nation At Risk: Reflections Ten Years Later," The College of William and Mary Distinguished Lecture Series, Williamsburg, Virginia: The College of William and Mary School of Education, 8.

72. Chester E. Finn, Jr., "National Standards: A Plan For Consensus," 3.

73. Ibid., 4 & 5.

74. Francie Alexander, (1993, February), "National Standards: A New Conventional Wisdom," Educational Leadership 50 (5), 9.

75. John O'Neil, (1993, February), "On the New Standards Project: A Conversation with Lauren Resnick and Warren Simmons," Educational Leadership, 50 (5), 17.

76. Maxine Green, (1989, Fall), "The Question of Standards," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 13.

77. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, (1989 Fall), "National Standards and Local Portraits," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 14.

78. Harold J. Noah, (1989, Fall), "An International Perspective on National Standards," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 18.

79. Ibid., 22.

80. John O'Neil, "On The New Standards Project," 20.

81. Jerome S. Bruner, (1989, Fall), "Comments," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 23.

82. Deborah W. Meier, (1989, Fall), "Comments," Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 26 & 27.

83. George Hanford, (1994, Fall), "Educational Standards and Reform," Educational Vision: The Magazine for Critical Thinking, 2 (1), 6.

84. Elliot W. Eisner, (1993, February), "Why Standards May Not Improve Schools," Educational Leadership, 50 (5), 22.

85. Francie Alexander, "National Standards: A New Conventional Wisdom," 10.

86. John O'Neil, (1993, February), "Can National Standards Make A Difference?", Educational Leadership, 50 (5), 6.

87. Ibid., 6.

88. Denny Schillings, (1993, September/October), "President's Message," The Social Studies Professional, 177, 2.

89. Ibid., 2.

90. David T. Kearns and Denis P. Doyle, (1989), Winning the Brain Race, San Francisco, California: ICS Press, 73.

91. Henry Kiernan and John Pyne, editors, (1993, Spring), "National Standards and Education Reform: Prospects and Sources," The Docket, 4.

92. Paul Gagnon, (1993, Spring), "Systematic Reforms of Schools: From National Standards to the Classroom Down the Hall," The Docket, 11.

93. Carol Innerst, "Americans Say National Standards Are Needed To Improve Education," 1.

94. Committee for Economic Development, (1991, September 27), "Employers and College Educators Give Dismal Assessment of the Education Provided Today's High School Graduates - Parents and Students Disagree," CED News Release, New York, 2.

95. Ibid., 2.

96. Ibid., 2-3.

97. National Education Goals Panel, National Education Goals Report, 4.

98. Ibid., 18.

99. Bradley Commission on History in Schools, (1988), Building A History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools, Washington, D.C.: Educational Excellence Network, 5.

100. Ibid., 1.

101. America 2000, 38.

102. C. Frederick Risinger, (1992), Current Directions in Social Studies, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2.

103. Ibid., 2 & 3.

104. William H. McNeil, Michael Kammen, and Gordon A. Craig, (1989), "Why Study History? Three Historians Respond," in Historical Literacy, edited by Paul Gagnon, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 103.

105. Education for Democracy Project, (1987), Education for

Democracy: A Statement of Principles, Washington, D.C.: Author, 8.

106. E.D. Hirsch, Jr., (1987), Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, xvi.

107. Paul Gagnon, editor, (1989), Democracy's Half Told Story: What American History Textbooks Should Add, Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 168.

108. Charlotte Crabtree, Gary B. Nash, Paul Gagnon, and Scott Waugh, editors, (1992), Lessons From History, Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles, The National Center for History in the Schools, iii.

109. Lynne Cheney, (1991), National Tests: What Other Countries Expect Their Students to Know, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1.

110. The National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, K-1-K-3.

111. Ibid., K-1-K-2.

112. Ibid., K-2

113. Ibid., K-3

114. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs, title page-1.

115. Ibid., 1-2

116. Federal News Service, "Education Standards News Conference," 23.

117. Ibid., 23.

118. Ibid., 26.

119. Ibid., 28.

120. Ibid., 29.

121. Ibid., 33.

122. Ibid., 34.

123. Ibid., 34.

124. Lynne V. Cheney, (1987, September), American Memory, Washington D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 5.

125. George Hanford, "Educational Standards and Reform," 7.

126. Henry Kiernan and John Pyne, "National Standards and Education Reform: Perspectives and Sources," 4.

127. E.D. Hirsch, Jr., (1987), Cultural Literacy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 133.

128. Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?, 47-73.

129. Ibid., 562-563.

130. Margit McGuire, (1992, January/February), "President's Message," The Social Studies Professional, 109, 2.

131. Louis Harris, (1991, September 27), "Remarks at the Education Press Conference," Washington, D.C.: National Press Club, 4.

132. C. Frederick Risinger, Current Directions in Social Studies, 1-18.

133. Ibid., 8.

134. James Davison Hunter, (1991), Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America, New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 198.

135. Ibid., 218-219.

136. Ibid., 220.

137. Charles F. Bahmueller, (1991), Civitas, Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education, 234.

138. Fredric Smoler, (1992, February/March), "What Should We Teach Our Children About American History?", American Heritage, 45.

139. Staff, (1990, August 29), "Sobol's Syllabus," Newsday, 81.

140. Fredric Smoler, "What Should We Teach Our Children About American History," 46.

141. Report of the New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee, (1991, June), One Nation, Many Peoples, Albany, New York: New York State Department of Education, 29.

142. Ibid., 35.

143. Ibid., 39.

144. Ibid., 43.

145. Ibid., 37 & 38

146. Ibid., 45.

147. Mario M. Cuomo, (1991, September), "Response to the Social Studies Committee," Basic Education, 36 (1), 4.

148. Ibid., 6.

149. Diane Ravitch, (1990, Spring), "Diversity and Democracy," American Educator, 16.

150. Ibid., 18.

151. Ibid., 18.

152. Mary Lefkowitz, (1993, April 7), "Afrocentrists Wage War on Ancient Greeks," Wall Street Journal.

153. Eva T.H. Brann, (1993, January 15), "Liberal Education and Multiculturalism: Friends or Enemies?", Vital Speeches of the Day, 43.

154. History-Social Studies Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee, History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, ix.

155. Ibid., ix.

156. Ronald W. Evans, (1989, May/June), "Diane Ravitch and the Revival of History: A Critique," The Social Studies, 80 (3), 87.

157. Paul Hemp, (1991, June 25), "Houghton Mifflin's Textbook Troubles," The Boston Globe, 21.

158. Ibid., 22.

159. Ellen K. Coughlin, (1992, January 29), "Scholars Confront Fundamental Question: Which Vision of America Should Prevail?", The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28 (21), A8.

160. Ibid., A11.

161. Ibid., A11.

162. Bernard Lewis, (1990, Summer), "Other People's History," American Scholar, 404-405.

163. Fredric Smoler, "What Should We Teach Our Children About American History?", 48-49.

164. Ibid., 46.

165. New York State United Teachers, (1991, November 12), 1991 Education Opinion Survey, New York: Fact Finders, 1-2.

166. James A. Banks, (192, September), "Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education," Social Education, 56 (5), 275 & 276.

167. Ibid., 279-293.

168. Gloria Ladson-Billings, (1992, September), "The Multicultural Mission: Unity and Diversity," Social Education, 56 (5), 309.

169. Ibid., 309.

170. Ibid., 309.

171. Robert K. Fullinwider, (1993, Spring), "Multiculturalism: Themes and Variations," Perspective, 5 (2), 15.

172. Ibid., 15.

173. Ibid., 15.

174. Rochelle L. Stanfield, (1991, July 6), "Whose History Should They Learn?", The National Journal, 23 (27), 75.

175. Ibid., 75.

176. Debra Viadero, "Diverse Group Begins Process of Developing Standards for History," 10.

177. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs, 3-4.

178. Ibid., 4.

179. Ibid., 13-14.

180. Ibid., 2-7, 10, 13-14, 19-21, 26.

181. Ibid., 19.

182. Charlotte Crabtree, Gary B. Nash, Paul Gagnon, and Scott Waugh, editors, Lessons From History, iii.

183. Ibid., iv.

184. Carol Innerst, (1991, December 17), "Agencies Want Kids to Improve Grasp of History," The Washington Times, A7.

185. Federal News Service, "Education Standards News Conference," 24.

186. Ibid., 24.

187. Gary Nash, David E. Baumbach, and John Pyne, (1992, November), "The Writing of National History Standards: Three Views," History Matters 5 (3), 1 & 5.

188. Elaine W. Reed, (1993, March), "National Standards Project-World History," History Matters, 5 (7), 1.

189. Ibid., 5.

190. Paul Gagnon, "Systematic Reforms of Schools: From National Standards to the Classroom Down the Hall," 11.

191. Chester E. Finn, Jr., "National Standards: A Plan for Consensus," 4-5.

192. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, 40.

193. Francie Alexander, "National Standards: A New Conventional Wisdom," 10.

194. Jeremy Kilpatrick, (1991, July 18), "Statement", speech before the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Washington, D.C., 1.

195. Bruce L. Wilson and Gretchen B. Rossman, Mandating Academic Excellence, 201-202.

196. Jack N. Porter and Ruth Taplin, (1987), Conflict and Conflict Resolution, New York: University Press of America, Inc., 63.

197. Ibid., 76.

198. Ibid., 76.

199. Ibid., 76-78.

200. Ibid., 79-80.

201. Thomas C. Schelling, (1963), The Strategy of Conflict, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 83.

202. Cheryl Hamilton and Cordell Parker, (1993), Communicating for Results, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 315.

203. Ibid., 315-316.

204. Robert Axelrod, (1981), The Evolution of Cooperation, New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 16.

205. Christopher W. Moore, (1986), The Mediation Process, San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 26-27.

206. Ibid., 26.

207. Ibid., 27.

208. Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research, 7.

209. Ibid., 13.

210. Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall, (1989), Educational Research: An Introduction, New York: Longman, 402.

211. Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research, 84.

212. Ibid., 84 & 85.

213. Christopher W. Moore, The Mediation Process, 26-27.

214. Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research, 85-93.

215. Ibid., 89.

216. Wolfgang Pindur, (1993, November 22), Class discussion.

217. Dwight Allen, (1993, December 10), Conversation.

218. Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research, 92.

219. Ibid., 93.

220. Ibid., 93-94

221. Ibid., 105.

222. Ibid., 106.

223. Ibid., 220.

224. Ibid., 106.

225. Ibid., 106.

226. Ibid., 107.

227. Ibid., 106.

228. Charlotte Crabtree, Application To The National Endowment for the Humanities, 15.

229. Ibid., 18.

230. Ibid., 18-19.

231. Ibid., 19.

232. Ibid., 19.

233. Ibid., 19.

234. Ibid., 20.

235. National Center for History in the Schools, (1992, February 11), "Organizational Structure of the National History Standards Project," an addendum to a letter from Charlotte Crabtree to the members of the National Council for History Standards, 2.

236. Ibid., 1.

237. Ibid., 2-3

238. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 13-28.

239. National History Standards Project, (1993, July and October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools, 9-10.

240. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 1-26.

241. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 9.

242. Ibid., 9.

243. Ibid., 9.

244. Ibid., 9.

245. Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash, (1992, December 16), letter to James B. Gardner and Robert Blackey, 3.

246. Federal News Service, "Education Standards News Conference," 34.

247. The Bradley Commission on History in Schools, Building A History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools,

inside cover.

248. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, Raising Standards for American Education, A-7.

249. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 14.

250. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 14.

251. Ibid., 13.

252. Ibid., 13.

253. Ibid., 13.

254. Ibid., 13.

255. Charlotte Crabtree, (1992, January 31), letter to author.

256. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 12.

257. Ibid., 12.

258. John Pyne, (1994, January 18), telephone interview with author.

259. Joan Arno, (1994, January 19), telephone interview with author.

260. Sara R. Shoob, (1994, January 17), telephone interview with author.

261. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (1992, April 24-25), "Recommendations to the National History Standards Project," Alexandria, Virginia, 5.

262. National Council for Social Studies Focus Group, (1992, May), "Report to the National History Standards Project," Lexington, Kentucky, 2.

263. American Historical Association, (1992, May 18), "Report of the World History Focus Group of the American Historical Association National History Standards Project," Washington, D.C., 1.

264. James B. Gardner, (1992, July 14), letter to Charlotte Crabtree, 1.

265. Susan Meisler, (1994, January 19), telephone interview with

author.

266. Earl Bell, (1994, January 17), telephone interview with author.

267. John Pyne, (1994, January 18), telephone interview with author.

268. John Pyne, (1994, February 13), questionnaire to author.

269. John Pyne, (1994, January 18), telephone interview with author.

270. David Vigilante, (1994, February 9), questionnaire to author.

271. Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 3-4.

272. Educational Excellence Network, (1992, April 24), "Recommendations to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: The Education Excellence Network, 4.

273. Ibid., 2-3.

274. Ibid., 3.

275. Ivan Gluckman, a representative of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 2.

276. Cesar Collantes, a representative of the League of United Latin American Citizens, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

277. Mary Futrell, a representative of the Quality Education for Minorities Network, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

278. Ruth Granados, a representative of the Council of the Great City Schools, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 2.

279. American Federation of Teachers, (1992, April 25), "Statement of the American Federation of Teachers to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 4.

280. Ibid., 4.

281. Cynthia Neverdon-Morton, a representative of the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

282. Penny Kemble, a representative of Education for Democracy, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

283. Nguyen Minh Chau, a representative of the National Association of Asian and Pacific American Education, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

284. Ibid., 1.

285. Sara R. Shoob, a representative of the National Association for Elementary School Principals, (192, April 20), memorandum to Charlotte Crabtree, 1.

286. Mabel Lake Murray, a representative of the National Alliance of Black School Educators, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

287. Clifford E. Trafzer, a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission, (1992, April 10), "National Forum for History Standards: Issues and Perspective," Riverside, California. 3.

288. Ibid., 6.

289. A Graham Down, President of the Council for Basic Education, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 1.

290. Ibid., 2.

291. Charles F. Bahmueller, Ph.D., (1992, April 24), "Guidelines for History Standards: Issues and Perspectives," Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education, 2-3.

292. Ibid., 3.

293. Josepf W. Konvitz, (1992), "Focus Group on Lessons from History," Westlake, Ohio: National Council for History Education, Inc., 3.

294. W. Jeffrey Welsh, (1992, April 9), letter to Elaine W.

Reed, 1.

295. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Recommendations to the National History Standards Project," 9.

296. Association of American Historians Focus Group Report, (1992, May 14), "Focus Group of the Organization of American Historians For the National History Standards Project," Bloomington, Indiana: Author, 5.

297. American Historical Association, (1992, May 18), "Report of the U.S. History Focus Group of the American Historical Association National History Standards Project," Washington, D.C.: Author, 7-8.

298. National History Standards Project, (1993, July), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 33-34.

299. Donald Woodruff, (1994, January 25), letter to author, 2.

300. Ibid., 1.

301. Joan Arno, (1994, January 19), telephone interview with author.

302. Linda Symcox (1994, March 3), Letter to author.

303. Anonymous.

304. Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash, (1992, November 24), letter to Robert Blackey.

305. James B. Gardner, (1992, December 2), letter to Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash.

306. National Council for History Standards, (1992, May 1), "Criteria for Standards," 1.

307. National Council for History Standards, (1992, May 1), "Criteria for Standards (Amended)," Washington, D.C., 1.

308. National Council for History Standards, (1992, September 25), "Criteria for Standards," Washington, D.C., 1.

309. National History Standards Project, (1993, July), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 33.

310. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 33.

311. National Council for History Standards, (1992, May 1), "Criteria for Standards," 2.

Progress Report and Sample Standards, 33.

311. National Council for History Standards, (1992, May 1), "Criteria for Standards," 2.

312. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Focus Group, (1992, May 22), "Notes: Comments and Recommendations," Alexandria, Virginia, 4.

313. National Council for History Standards, (1993, September 25), "Criteria for Standards," 2.

314. Ibid., 2.

315. James B. Gardner, (1992, July 14) letter to Charlotte Crabtree, 1.

316. Robert Blackey, (1992, December 2), letter to Charlotte Crabtree, 2.

317. Ibid., 2.

318. James B. Gardner, (1992, December 2), letter to Charlotte Crabtree, 2.

319. National History Standards Project, (1993, October), Progress Report and Sample Standards, 34.

320. Ramsay Selden, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

321. Morton Keller, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

322. Theodore Rabb, (1994, January 30), telephone interview with author.

323. Ibid.

324. Theodore Rabb, (1993, January 14), letter to Louise Tilly, 1.

325. Ibid., 1.

326. William McNeil, (1994, February 4), interview with author.

327. Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash to the American Historical Association and the American Historical Association to Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash, (1992, July through 1993, April), Archives of the National History Standards Project, Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

330. Ibid.

331. Peter J. Cheoros, (1994, January 18), telephone interview with author.

332. Donald Woodruff, (1994, Jnuary 15), telephone interview with author.

333. Christopher W. Moore, (1986), The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict, San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

334. John Pyne, (1994, January 18), telephone interview with author.

335. David Baumback, (1994, February 5), interview with author and questionnaire.

336. Joan Arno, (1994, January 19), telephone interview with author.

337. Earl Bell, (1994, January 17), telephone interview with author.

338. Diane Brooks, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

339. David Battini, (1994, January 17), telephone interview with author and questionnaire.

340. Diane Ravitch, (1994, February 18), telephone interview with author.

341. Elaine W. Reed, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

342. David Vigilante, (1994, February 9), questionnaire to author.

343. Joan Arno, (1994, January 26), letter to author.

344. Marilyn Hala, (1994, February 10), telephone interview with author.

345. Ibid.

346. Ramsey Selden, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

347. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, (1994, February 16), telephone interview with author.

348. C. Frederick Risinger, (1994, January 21), telephone interview with author and questionnaire.

349. Joan Arno, (1994, January 19), telephone interview with author.

350. Theodore Rabb, (1994, January 30), telephone interview with author.

351. David Battini, (1994, January 17), telephone interview with author and questionnaire.

352. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., (1992), The Disuniting of America, New York: W.W. Norton & Compnay, 134.

353. Ibid., 136-137.

354. Ibid., 138.

355. Clifford E. Trafzer, a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission, (1992, April 10), "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards," Washington, D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill, 6.

356. Ibid., 6.

357. Education for Democracy Project, (1987), Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles, Washington, D.C.: Author, 10.

358. Diane Ravitch, (1994, February 18), telephone interview with author.

359. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, (1994, February 18), questionnaire to author.

360. Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research., 89.

361. A. Graham Down, (1994, February 14), questionnaire to author.

362. Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer O'Day, (1991, June 4), "Putting the Pieces Together: Systemic School Reform," CPRE Policy Briefs, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, 5.

363. Dwight W. Allen, Schools for a New Century, 1.

364. Ibid., 102.

365. Morton Keller, (1994, February 5), interview with author.

366. National Education Goals Panel, (1993, November 15), Report to the National Education Goals Panel, Washington, D.C.: Author, 5.

367. David Hornbeck, (1994, January), "The OTL Debate," Basic Education, 38 (5), 3.

368. Dennis Gray, (1994, January), "National Standards: A Contrary View," Basic Education, 38 (5), 8-9.

369. Scott Willis, (1994, January), "Opinions Clash on Curriculum Standards," ACSD Update, 36 (1), 6.

370. Ibid., 6.

371. Ibid., 6.

372. Ibid., 7.

373. Ibid., 7.

374. National Education Goals Panel, (1993, November 15), Report to the National Education Goals Panel, Washington, D.C.: Author, 5.

## Bibliography

Alexander, Francie. (1993, February). "National Standards: A New Conventional Wisdom." Educational Leadership, 50(5), 9 & 10.

Allen, Dwight W. (1992). Schools For A New Century: A Conservative Approach to Radical School Reform. New York: Praeger Publishers.

_____. (1993, December 10). Conversation. Norfolk, Virginia: Old Dominion University.

America 2000: An Education Strategy. (1991). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

American Federation of Teachers. (1992, April 25). "Statement of the American Federation of Teachers to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

American Historical Association. (1992, July through April 1993). Letters to Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash. Archives of the National History Standards Project. Los Angeles, California: University of California, Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

_____. (1992, May 18). "Report of the U.S. History Focus Group of the American Historical Association National History Standards Project." Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1992, May 18). "Report of the World History Focus Group of the American Historical Association National History Standards Project." Washington D.C.

_____. (1993, April). "Washington Notes." Perspectives. Washington D.C.: Author.

Arno, Joan. (1994, January 26). Letter to author.

_____. (1994, January 19). Telephone interview with author.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1992, April 24-25). "Recommendations to the National History Standards Project." Alexandria, Virginia.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Focus Group. (1992, May 22). "Notes: Comments and Recommendations." Alexandria, Virginia.

Axelrod, Robert. (1981). The Evolution of Cooperation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Bahmueller, Charles F. (1991). Civitas. Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education.

_____. (1992, April 24). "Guidelines for History Standards: Issues and Perspectives." Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education.

Banks, James A. (1992, September). "Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education." Social Education, 56(5), 274-294.

Banks, Samuel L. (1994, February 18). Questionnaire to author.

Battini, David. (1994, January 15). Questionnaire.

_____. (1994, January 17). Telephone interview with author.

Baumbach, David. (1994, February 5). Questionnaire to author.

_____. (1994, February 5). Telephone interview with author.

Bell, Earl. (1994, January 17). Telephone interview with author.

Bell, Terrel H. (1993, February 22). "A Nation at Risk: Reflections Ten Years Later." The College of William and Mary Distinguished Lecture Series. Williamsburg, Virginia: The College of William and Mary School of Education.

Berube, Maurice R. (1991). American Presidents and Education. New York: Greenwood Press.

Blackey, Robert. (1992, December 2). Letter to Charlotte Crabtree.

Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longman.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1983). High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Bradley Commission on History in Schools. (1989). Building A History Curriculum: Guidelines For Teaching History In Schools. Washington D.C.: Education Excellence Network.

_____. (1989). Historical Literacy: The Case for History in American Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Brann, Eva T. H. (1993, January 15). "Liberal Education and Multiculturalism: Friends or Enemies?" Vital Speeches of the Day.

Brooks, Diane. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Bruner, Jerome S. (1989, Fall). "Comments." Teachers College Record, 91(1), 22 & 23.

Castillo, Pedro. (1994, January 27). Telephone interview with author.

"Charting A Course For Reform: A Chronology." (1993, February 10). Education Week: Special Report.

Chau, Nguyen Minh. A representative of the National Association of Asian and Pacific American Education. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Cheney, Lynne V. (1987, September). American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools. Washington D.C.: The National Endowment for the Humanities.

_____. (1991). National Tests: What Other Countries Expect Their Students To Know. Washington D.C.: The National Endowment for the Humanities.

Cheoros, Peter J. (1994, January 18). Questionnaire.

_____. (1994, January 18). Telephone interview with author.

Clinton, William. (1992, October). "The Clinton Plan for Excellence in Education". Phi Beta Kappa, 131-138.

Collantes, Cesar. A representative of the League of United Latin American Citizens. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Committee for Economic Development. (1991, September 27). "Employers and College Educators Give Dismal Assessment of the Education Provided Today's High School Graduates - Parents and Students Disagree." CED News Release. New York.

Coughlin, Ellen K. (1992, January 29). "Scholars Confront Fundamental Question: Which Vision of America Should Prevail?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28(21), A8 & A11.

Crabtree, Charlotte. (1991, November 5). Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs. Los Angeles, California: University of Los Angeles National Center for History in Schools.

_____. (1992, January 31). Letter to the author.

Crabtree, Charlotte and Gary Nash. (1992, November 24). Letter to Robert Blackey.

_____. (1992, December 16). Letter to James B. Gardner and Robert Blackey.

_____. (1992, July through April 1993). Letters to the American Historical Association. Archives of the National History Standards Project. Los Angeles, California: University of California, Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

Crabtree, Charlotte, Gary B. Nash, Paul Gagnon, and Scott Waugh. Editors. (1992). Lessons From History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire. Los Angles, California: University of Califonia at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

Cuomo, Mario M. (1991, September). "Response to the Social Studies Committee." Basic Education, 36(1), 2-6.

Curriculum Of Inclusion, Report of the Commissioner's Task Force on Minorities: Equity and Excellence. (1989). Albany, New York: New York State Department of Education.

Down, A. Graham. President of the Council for Basic Education. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Forum for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

_____. (1994, February 14). Questionnaire to author.

Education for Democracy Project. (1987). Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles. Washington D.C.: Author.

Educational Excellence Network. (1992, April 24). "Recommendations to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Author.

Eisner, Elliot W. (1993, February). "Why Standards May Not Improve Schools." Educational Leadership, 50(5), 22-23.

Evans, Ronald W. (1989, May/June). "Diane Ravitch and the Revival of History: A Critique." The Social Studies, 80(3), 85-88.

Federal News Service. (1991, December 16). "Education Standards News Conference." Washington D.C.: Federal Information Systems Corporation.

_____. (1992, January 24). "National Council on Education Standards and Testing News Conference." Washington D.C.: Federal Information Systems Corporation.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. (1989, Fall). "National Standards: A Plan for Consensus." Teachers College Record, 91(1), 3-9.

_____. (1983, April). "The Drive for Educational Excellence: Moving Toward A Public Consensus." Change, 15(3), 14-22.

_____. (1991). We Must Take Charge: Our Schools and Our Future. New York: The Free Press.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. (1994, February 18). Questionnaire to author.

_____. (1994, February 16). Telephone interview with author.

Fullinwider, Robert K. (1993, Spring). "Multiculturalism: Themes and Variations." Perspective, 5(2).

Futrell, Mary Hatwood. A representative of Quality Education for Minorities Network. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Gagnon, Paul. (1993, Spring). "Systematic Reforms of Schools: From National Standards to the Classroom Down the Hall." The Docket, 8-11.

_____ . Editor. (1989). Democracy's Half-Told Story: What American History Textbooks Should Add. Washington D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Gardner, James B. (1992, July 14). Letter to Charlotte Crabtree.

_____. (1992, December 2). Letter to Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash.

Gluckman, Ivan. A representative of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1992, April 10). Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Gore, Phillip Babcok. Editor. (1969). Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company.

Granados, Ruth. A representative of the Council of the Great City Schools." (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Gray, Dennis. (1994, January). "National Standards: A Contrary View." Basic Education, 38(5).

Green, Maxine. (1989, Fall). "The Question of Standards." Teachers College Record, 91(1), 9-14.

Hala, Marilyn. (1994, February 10). Telephone interview with author.

Hamilton, Cheryl and Cordell Parker. (1993). Communicating For Results. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Hanford, George. (1994, Fall). "Educational Standards and Reform." Educational Vision: The Magazine for Critical Thinking, 2(1), 6-7.

Harris, Louis. (1991, September 27). "Remarks at the Education Press Conference." Washington D.C.: National Press Club.

Hemp, Paul. (1991, June 25). "Houghton Mifflin's Textbook Troubles." The Boston Globe, 21 & 22.

Hine, Darlene Clark. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs To Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee. (1987). History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education.

Hornbeck, David. (1994, January). "The OTL Debate." Basic Education, 38 (5).

Hunter, James Davidson. (1991). Culture Wars: The Struggle To Define America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Innerst, Carol. (1991, December 17). "Agencies Want Kids To Improve Grasp of History." The Washington Times, A7.

_____. (1991, August 23). "Americans Say National Standards Are Needed to Improve Education." The Washington Times.

Kean, Thomas H. (1989, October 31). "Remarks." Washington D.C.: Fortune Magazine Education Summit.

Kearns, David T. and Denis P. Doyle. (1989). Winning The Brain Race. San Francisco, California: ICS Press.

Keller, Morton. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Kemble, Penn. A representative of Education for Democracy. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Kiernan, Henry and John Pyne. Editors. (1993, Spring). "National Standards and Educational Reform: Prospects and Sources."

The Docket, 1-7.

Kilpatrick, Jeremy. (1991, July 18). "Statement." Speech before the National Council on Education Standards and Testing. Washington D.C.

Konvitz, Josef W. (1992). "Focus Group Report on Lessons from History." Westlake, Ohio: National Council for History Education, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (1992, September). "The Multicultural Mission: Unity and Diversity." Social Education, 56(5), 308-311.

Lefkowitz, Mary. (1993, April 7). "Afrocentrists Wage War on Ancient Greeks." Wall Street Journal.

Lewis, Bernard. (1990, Summer). "Other People's History." American Scholar, 397-405.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. (1989, Fall). "National Standards and Local Portraits." Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 14-17.

McCollough, Thomas E. (1991). The Moral Imagination and Public Life: Raising Ethical Questions. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.

McGuire, Margit. (1992, January/February). "President's Message." The Social Studies Professional, 109, 2.

McNeil, William. (1994, February 4). Interview with author.

McNeil, William H., Michael Kammen, and Gordon A. Craig. (1989). "Why Study History? Three Historians Respond." Historical Literacy edited by Paul Gagnon. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Meier, Deborah W. (1989, Fall). "Comments." Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 25-27.

Meisler, Susan. (1994, January 19). Telephone interview with author.

Moore, Christopher W. (1986). The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Murray, Mabel Lake. A representative of the National Alliance 6
Black School Educators. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

Nash, Gary, David E. Baumbach, and John Pyne. (1992, November). "The Writing of National History Standards: Three Views." History Matters, 5 (3), 1 & 5.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1992, February 11). "Organizational Structure of the National History Standards Project." An addendum to a letter from Charlotte Crabtree to the members of the National Council for History Standards.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington D.C.: Department of Education.

National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. (1989). Charting A Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century. Washington D.C.: Author.

National Council for History Standards. (1992, May 1). "Criteria for Standards." Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1992, May 1). "Criteria for Standards (Amended)." Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1992, September 25). "Criteria for Standards." Washington D.C.: Author.

National Council on Education Standards and Testing. (1992, January 24). Raising Standards for American Education. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Council for Social Studies Focus Group. (1992, May). "Report to the National History Standards Project." Lexington, Kentucky.

National Education Goals Panel. (1991, September 30). "News Conference: Release of First Report." Washington D.C.: National Press Club.

_____. (1993, November 15). Promises to Keep: Creating High Standards for American Students. Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1993, November 15). Report to the National Education Goals Panel. Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1991, September 27-28). "Summary of Public Comment." Des Moines, Iowa: National Education Forum.

_____. (1992). The National Education Goals Report. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National History Standards Project. (1993, July). Progress Report and Sample Standards. Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

_____. (1993, October). Progress Report and Sample Standards. Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles National Center for History in the Schools.

National History Standards Project. (March, 1994). Progress Report and Draft Standards. Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles, National Center for History in the Schools.

Neverdon-Morton, Cynthia. A representative of the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History. (1992, April 10). "Testimony to the National Council for History Standards." Washington D.C.: Quality Hotel, Capitol Hill.

New York State United Teachers. (1991, November 12). 1991 Education Opinion Survey: Final Report. New York: Fact Finders.

Noah, Harold J. (1989, Fall). "An International Perspective on National Standards." Teachers College Record, 91 (1), 17-22.

Office of the Press Secretary. (1991, June 17). "Remarks by the President In Address to Grand Junction Community." Washington D.C.: The White House.

O'Neil, John. (1993, February). "Can National Standards Make A Difference?" Educational Leadership, 50 (5), 4-8.

_____. (1993, February). "On the New Standards Project: A Conversation with Lauren Resnick and Warren Simmons." Educational Leadership, 50 (5), 17-21.

Organization of American Historians Focus Group. (1992, May 14). "Focus Group of the Organization of American Historians For the National History Standards Project." Bloomington, Indiana: Author.

Patrick, John. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Pindur, Wolfgang. (1993, November 22). Class discussion. Norfolk, Virginia: Old Dominion University.

Porter, Jack Nusan and Ruth Taplin. (1987). Conflict and Conflict Resolution: A Sociological Introduction With Updated Bibliography and Theory Section. New York: University Press of America, Inc.

Pyne, John. (1994, January 18). Telephone interview with author.

Rabb, Theodore. (1993, January 30). Letter to Louise Tilly.

_____. (1994, January 30). Telephone interview with author.

Ravitch, Diane. (1990, Spring). "Diversity and Democracy: Multicultural Education in America." American Educator, 16-20 & 46-48.

_____. (1994, February 18), telephone interview with author.

_____. Editor. (1990). The American Reader: Words That Moved A Nation. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

_____. (1984, Spring). "The Continuing Crisis: Fashions In Education." The American Scholar, 183-193.

Ravitch, Diane and Chester E. Finn, Jr. (1987). What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Reed, Elaine W. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Report of the New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee. (1991, June). One Nation, Many Peoples: A Declaration of Cultural Interdependence. Albany, New York: New York State Department of Education.

Riddle, Wayne, James Stedman, and Paul Irwin. (1991, October 3). National Education Goals: Federal Policy Issues. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Riley, Richard W. (1993, Fall). "A Conversation with the U.S. Secretary of Education." National Forum, LXXIII (4), 5-7.

_____. (1993, Summer). "Interview." Technos, 2 (2), 4- 7.

_____. (1993). "Remarks." Education Commission of the States' National Forum and Annual Meeting. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

_____. (1993, September). "Time for America to Get Serious About Our Children." Community Update, 6, p. 1-3.

Risinger, C. Frederick. (1992). Current Directions in Social Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

_____. (1994, January 21). Questionnaire.

_____. (1994, January 21). Telephone interview with author.

Schelling, Thomas C. (1963). The Strategy of Conflict. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Schillings, Denny. (1993, September/October). "President's Message." The Social Studies Professional, 117, 2.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. (1991). The Disuniting of America. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Selden, Ramsay. (1994, February 5). Interview with author.

Shoob, Sara R. A representative of the National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1992, April 20). Memorandum to Charlotte Crabtree.

_____. (1994, January 17). Telephone interview with author.

Smith, Marshall S. and Jennifer O'Day. (1991, June 4). "Putting the Pieces Together: Systemic School Reform." CPRE Policy Brief. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Smoler, Fredric. (1992, February/March). "What Should We Teach Our Children About American History?" American Heritage, 45-52.

Social Studies Professional. (1992, January/February). "Asante Discusses African-Centered Education." Newsletter of the National Council for the Social Studies, 109 (1). Washington D.C.

Staff. (1990, August 29). "Sobol's Syllabus." Newsday.

Stanfield, Rochelle L. (1991, July 6). "Whose History Should They Learn?" The National Journal, 23 (27), 73-75.

Symcox, Linda. (1993, September 9). Letter to author.

_____. (1994, February 15). Telephone interview with author.

_____. (1994, March 3), Letter to Author.

The Center for the New American Community Manhattan Institute, 1994. Alternatives to Afrocentrism, Preface by Linda Chavez, John J. Miller, Editor.

Thompson, Charles S. and Edward C. Rathmell. (1988, May). "NCTM's Standards for School Mathematics, K-12." Mathematics Teacher, 81 (5), 348-351.

Trafzer, Clifford E. A representative of the Native American Heritage Commission. (1992, April 10). "National Forum for History Standards: Issues and Perspectives." Riverside, California: Native American Heritage Commission.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993, September 23). "Riley Asks Congress for Sweeping Improvements in School Programs for the Poor." Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1993, November 12). Standards For All: A Vision for Education in the 21st Century. Washington D.C.: Author.

_____. (1993, October 5). The Goals 2000: Educate America Act: Making American Education Great Again. Washington D.C.: Author.

Viadero, Debra. (1992, March 4). "Diverse Group Begins Process of Developing Standards for History." Education Week, 10.

Vigilante, David. (1994, February 9). Interview with author.

_____. (1994, February 9). Questionnaire to author.

Wagoner, Jennings L., Jr. (1989, September). Unpublished paper entitled "Thomas Jefferson on Public Education and an Enlightened Society: Selected Quotations." Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. (1987). Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company.

Welsh, W. Jeffrey. (1992, April 9). Letter to Elaine W. Reed.

Willis, Scott. (1994, January). "Opinions Clash on Curriculum Standards." ACSD Update, 36(2).

Wilson, Bruce L. and Gretchen B. Rossman. (1993). Mandating Academic Excellence: High School Response to State Curriculum Reform. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Woodruff, Donald. (1994, January 25). Letter to author.

_____. (1994, January 15). Telephone interview with author.

Yin, Robert K. (1989). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.